A

COMMENTARY

ON THE

HOLY SCRIPTURES:

CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND HOMILETICAL,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MINISTERS AND STUDENTS.

BY

(JOHN) PETER LANGE, D.D.,

IN CONNECTION WITH A NUMBER OF EMINENT EUROPEAN DIVINES.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, AND EDITED, WITH ADDITIONS,

BY

PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.,

IN CONNECTION WITH AMERICAN SCHOLARS OF VARIOUS EVANGELICAL DENOMINATIONS.

VOL. V. OF THE NEW TESTAMENT: CONTAINING THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,
1899.

THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

ROMANS.

BY

J. P. LANGE, D.D., AND THE REV. F. R. FAY.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

BY

J. F. HURST, D.D.,
PRESIDENT OF DREW THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, MADISON, N. J.

REVISED, ENLARGED, AND EDITED

BY

P. SCHAFF, D.D., AND M. B. RIDDLE, D.D.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,
1899.

TROW'S
PRINTING AND BOOKBINDING COMPANY,
205-213 *East 12th St.*,
NEW YORK.

PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION.

THE Epistle to the Romans is the Epistle of the Epistles, as the Gospel of John is the Gospel of the Gospels. It is the heart of the doctrinal portion of the New Testament It presents in systematic order the fundamental truths of Christianity in their primitive purity, inexhaustible depth, all-conquering force, and never-failing comfort. It is the bulwark of the evangelical doctrines of sin and grace against the obscuration of the gospel, whether by judaizing bigotry or paganizing licentiousness. Addressed to the Christians at Rome, and unfolding to them the gospel as a spiritual power of God unto salvation far exceeding in effect, and outlasting in time, the temporal power of the Imperial City, it prophetically anticipates and positively overthrows every essential error of Romanism, and is to this day the best antidote against popery. No wonder that it was so highly prized by the Reformers. Luther, whom Coleridge regarded "the only fit commentator on Paul," called the Romans "the chief part of the New Testament, and the purest gospel, well worthy to be committed to memory word for word by every Christian man, and to be pondered daily and enjoyed as the daily bread of the soul. It can never be too often nor too well read and considered, and the more it is understood, the better it tastes." Those who have studied it most carefully, are most likely to fall in with the judgment of Coleridge, that it is "the most profound work in existence."

But it is certainly also the most difficult book of the New Testament, unless we except the Gospel of John and the Revelation. Meyer, the ablest philological exegete of the age, humbly confesses, in the preface to the fourth edition of his commentary, to a growing sense of our inability to do justice to "the grandest, the boldest, and, in all its depths and heights, the most complete composition of the greatest apostle." If St. Peter did not hesitate to state that there are "some things hard to be understood" in the Epistles of his "beloved brother Paul," we need not be surprised that even such divines as occupy the same general platform widely differ in their interpretations. The Epistle to the Romans, more than any other, is a battle-field; and every chapter, especially the third, the fifth, the seventh, and the ninth, is contested ground. Not a few commentators deal with it as Procrustes dealt with his victims, in adapting them to the length of his iron bedstead—either stretching out or cutting off their legs. But after all, vast progress has been made, especially within the last fifty years, toward an impartial and thorough understanding of this wonderful production of a wonderful man.

Among the many noble contributions of German learning and industry to this end, Dr. Lange's Commentary—which is here presented, with many additions, in an English dress—will occupy an honourable and useful position. It appeared first in 1865, and in a second edition in 1868, in a small but closely-printed volume of 289 pages, as part of his *Bibelwerk*. It is evidently the result of much earnest labor and profound research, and presents many new and striking views. These, however, are not always expressed with that clearness demanded by the practical common sense of the English reader; hence the difficult labor of translation has been occasionally supplemented by the delicate task of explanation.

Dr. Lange prepared the Exegetical and Doctrinal parts, the Rev. F. R. Fay, his son-in-law, and pastor at Crefeld, Prussia, the Homiletical sections.

The English edition is the result of the combined labor of the Rev. Dr. Hurst, the Rev. M. B. Riddle, and the General Editor. Dr. Hurst is responsible for the translation (which was an unusually difficult task), and for the valuable Homiletical selections from the best English sources. The General Editor and the Rev. M. B. Riddle, besides carefully comparing the translation with the original, prepared the text, with the Critical notes, and the additions to the Exegetical and Doctrinal sections. The initials indicate the authorship of the various additions in brackets, which increase the volume of the German edition *nearly one half*. Upon no other book, except Matthew and Genesis, has so much original labor been bestowed.

I am responsible for the General and Special Introduction, and the first six chapters (exclusive of the last few verses of chap. vi.), which cover about one half of the volume. I examined nearly all the authorities quoted by Dr. Lange, from Chrysostom down to the *latest* editions of Tholuck and Meyer, and also the principal English commentators, as Stuart, Hodge, Alford, Wordsworth, Jowett, Forbes, &c., who are sublimely ignored by continental commentators, as if exegesis had never crossed the English Channel, much less the Atlantic Ocean. The length of some of my annotations (*e. g.*, on chaps. i., iii., and v.) may be justified by the defects of the original, and the great importance of the topics for the English and American mind.

I had a strong desire to complete the work, and to incorporate portions of a German Commentary on Romans which I prepared years ago in connection with my lectures as professor of theology, as well as the results of more recent studies. But a multiplicity of engagements, and a due regard for my health, compelled me to intrust the remaining chapters, together with my whole apparatus, including my notes in manuscript and a printed essay on the ninth chapter, to my friend, the Rev. M. B. Riddle. As an excellent German and Biblical scholar, and as editor of the Commentaries on Galatians and Colossians in the *Biblework*, Mr. Riddle has all the qualifications and experience, as well as that rare and noble enthusiasm which is indispensable for the successful completion of such a difficult and responsible task.

It is hoped that, by this combination of talent and labor, the Commentary on Roman has gained in variety, richness, and adaptation to the use of English students.

PHILIP SCHAFF.

No. 5 Bible House, New York, *April* 20 1869.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

ROMANS.

INTRODUCTION.

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATION.

As the Epistle to the Romans is the most important and prominent of the Pauline Epistles, we must here discuss first the general preliminary questions connected with the life, doctrine, and writings of the Apostle. This introduction, therefore, divides itself into a general and a special introduction. The first connects with the general introduction of the "Bible-Work" on *Matthew* [p. 20 ff. Am. ed.] for the New Testament, and on *Genesis* [p. 1 ff. Am. ed.] for the Old; the second corresponds with the introductions to our commentaries on the remaining Epistles of Paul.

I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE EPISTLES OF PAUL.

§ 1. THE PAULINE PORTION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The apostolic activity of the great Apostle to the Gentiles was so comprehensive and fruitful, that the greater portion of the labors of the original twelve apostles was merged into the historical current of his work. It is only the Coptic Church, and a few other isolated Oriental sects, that, as a portion of the original apostolic territory, have continued isolated from Paul's great field of labor. Since the second century, Paul's peculiar type of teaching began indeed to give way more and more to the forms of ancient and mediæval Catholicism; though Catholicism cannot be termed Petrine in that sense, and much less in that degree, in which the Church of Rome claims to be built on Peter. Yet Paul's spirit continued to exert its influence through the middle ages, not only in the heretical form of Paulicianism and other sects, but also in the orthodox type of Augustinism, until it broke forth from the innermost life of the Church as the chief organizing power of Evangelical Protestantism.*

* [Dr. LANGE (*Das Apostol. Zeitalter*, vol. ii. p. 649) adopts substantially the ingenious view, first suggested by JOACHIM FLORIS, and recently more fully developed by the great philosopher SCHELLING, and favored by eminent German divines, such as NEANDER, ULLMANN, THIERSCH, that the three representative apostles, Peter, Paul, and John, are the types of three successive ages of Christianity: Peter the apostle of law and Catholicism, Paul the apostle of freedom and Protestantism, John the apostle of love and the church of the future which is to harmonise authority and freedom, unity and variety. Schelling, shortly before his death, at Ragatz, Switzerland, Aug. 1854, in a very interesting conversation with the writer of this note, emphatically affirmed his unshaken belief in this view, to which he had given repeated and profound reflection. It is certainly no mere accident that Catholicism professes to be founded on Peter, while Protestantism has at all times mainly appealed to Paul, the apostle of faith, of freedom, of independence, and of progress. Even the

As far as the Pauline portion of the New Testament is concerned, it constitutes not only the greatest part of the apostolic epistles, but also a large share of the entire New Testament, especially when we include both the writings of Luke and the Epistle to the Hebrews, which were evidently written under the influence of the Apostle of the Gentiles.

An eternal triumph of Christianity, an imperishable sign and pledge of its world-conquering power, lies in the fact that the greatest part of the Christian Church, the greatest portion of the New Testament, and the most powerful expression of Christian doctrine, proceeded from a man who, endowed with a lofty genius and a heroic energy of will, had cast all the enthusiasm of his youth into a fanatical hatred of Christianity, and who had made it the great object of his life to exterminate that religion from the face of the earth. With the conversion of Paul, the noblest prince of Pharisæism was changed from an arch-enemy of Christ into his most active apostle and witness. This was a prelude to the world-historical change by which the eagle of the heathen power of Rome was converted from the work of a vulture that vexed the fold of Christ, into the service of a dove of peace for the nations of the earth. SAUL became PAUL. In this one word all the past triumphs of Christianity over its foes are embraced, and all its future triumphs are described in advance. To bend or to break—that is the question; to bend, like Paul, or to break, like Julian the Apostate. The cause of this wonderful power of conversion and of judgment lies in the universal triumph of Christ, against whom a Paul was not too great an enemy, nor a Julian too crafty a politician and emperor.

Concerning the signification of PAUL in the New Testament, CALMET thus speaks in the introduction to his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: "*Post sacrosancta evangelia venerabile maxime ac ceterorum omnium pretiosissimum monumentum Pauli epistolæ habendæ sunt. Omnia in illis continentur, quæ formandis moribus, sive ad mysteria et religionem constituendam a Jesu Christo tradita sunt. Tamquam supplementum et interpretatio eorum, quæ Jesus Christus docuit, ac veluti alterum evangelium Jesu Christi e mortuis redivivi jure meritoque reputantur.*" [H. EWALD, the great orientalist, commences his *Commentary on the Pauline Epistles* (Göttingen, 1857), with the following striking and truthful eulogy: "Considering these Epistles for themselves only, and apart from the general significance of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, we must still admit that, in the whole history of all centuries and of all nations, there is no other set of writings of similar extent, which, as creations of the fugitive moment, have proceeded from such severe troubles of the age, and such profound pains and sufferings of the author himself, and yet contain such an amount of healthfulness, serenity, and vigor of immortal genius, and touch with such clearness and certainty on the very highest truths of human aspiration and action. . . . The smallest as well as the greatest of these Epistles seem to have proceeded from the fleeting moments of this earthly life only to enchain all eternity; they were born of anxiety and bitterness of human strife, to set forth in brighter lustre and with higher certainty their superhuman grace and beauty. The divine assurance and firmness of the old prophets of Israel, the all-transcending glory and immediate spiritual presence of the Eternal King and Lord, who had just ascended to heaven, and all the art and culture

antagonism of Protestantism and Romanism has its typical antecedent in the temporary collision of Paul and Peter at Antioch, and the earnest protest of Paul against any compromise with judaising principles or customs. The idea of Schelling furnishes a fruitful hint for a comprehensive evangelical Catholic philosophy of Church history. But it must be wisely defined and qualified, and, as Lange intimates, it holds good only with regard to the elements of truth, and not to the extremes, contradictions, and defects, in the various historical types of Christianity. For in the Epistles of Peter there is not the faintest trace of hierarchical pretension and judaising legalism and ritualism; on the contrary, a striking substantial agreement with the system of Paul. Nor do we find, on the other hand, that Paul gives the least countenance to that unhistorical and unchurchly individualism and one-sided intellectualism into which much of our modern Protestantism has degenerated. It must also be admitted, that in no age or section of Christianity was the spirit of any of the three leading apostles entirely wanting. There were truly evangelical men and tendencies at work in the bosom of mediæval Catholicism, and they are not wholly extinct even in the Roman church of the present day; while the tendency to legalism, formality, intolerance, and exclusivism may be found also in the bosom of Protestantism; and the lovely harmonizing spirit of John is alive more or less among true believers in all sections of Christendom. So in a similar way the law and the promise, the sacerdotal office and the prophetic spirit, accompanied the Old Testament dispensation through the stages of its development to John the Baptist, the immediate forerunner of the first advent of Christ. Comp. below, p. 13, and SCHAFF's *History of the Apost. Church*, pp. 674-678.—P. S.]

of a ripe and wonderfully excited age, seem to have joined, as it were, in bringing forth the new creation of these Epistles of the times which were destined to last for all times." Upon the whole, St. Paul is, perhaps, the most remarkable man, and his Epistles, next to the Gospels, the most important literary production of all ages. Dr. WORDSWORTH strongly recommends the reading of the Pauline Epistles in their chronological order, so as to accompany the Apostle, with the help of the Acts, in his missionary career from the call at Damascus to the martyrdom in Rome, and his development of Christian doctrine from the elementary truths of the Thessalonians to the farewell instructions of the Pastoral Letters. The reader will thus trace with growing delight this spiritual river of Paradise from its fountain-head, through Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece, to Rome, diffusing purity and health, flowing onward in a majestic and ever-widening flood, fertilizing the banks, that they may bear the flowers and trees of Christian graces, and terminating at last in the ocean of eternity.—P. S.]

§ 2. PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE GENTILES. HISTORY OF HIS LIFE.*

The history of the life of the Apostle Paul divides itself, according to great crises, into the following periods: I. The time of his youthful development to his conversion; II. The time of his apostolic training, his impulsive and enthusiastic beginnings, and his purifying retreats; III. The period of the three great missionary journeys recounted in the Scriptures, down to his capture in Jerusalem, and his transportation from Cæsarea to Rome; IV. The termination of his career to his martyrdom.

A. *The History of the Youth of Paul to his Conversion.*

Paul appears first before us at the place of execution of the protomartyr Stephen, under the Jewish name of SAUL (שָׁאוּל), Acts vii. 57. He is a young man, who pursues his studies in Jerusalem in the school of the conservative Pharisee, Gamaliel (Acts xxii. 3; comp. Acts v. 34); but in consequence of his fanatical enthusiasm for the Pharisaic law, which he identified with the ancestral faith (Phil. iii. 5, 6), he became, while a student, the most bitter persecutor and disturber of the youthful Church of Christ; for he considered that Church a fatal Jewish heresy, and one which, by virtue of the rights of zealots for the law, he designed to combat, and hoped utterly to destroy. Probably Moses, Phinehas, and Elijah were his imaginary prototypes; while he adjudged Christ to be the greatest of those false prophets against whom destruction was prophesied and appointed (Deut. xviii. 20). From an accomplice who, being present at the execution of Stephen, took charge of the clothes belonging to his witnesses and executioners (Acts vii. 58), he soon became a servant of the Sanhedrin†; and having become excited by the martyr-blood of Stephen, he not only continued the persecution, and scattered the congregation in Jerusalem, but, being clothed with extraordinary authority, he entered upon a journey to Damascus for the purpose of destroying the Christian congregation in that city. The Sanhedrin did not at that time possess authority over the life and death of the Jews (John xviii. 31), but it was nevertheless at liberty to exercise, in matters of religion, the Jewish authority to imprison, to scourge, and to arrange all the preliminaries of a trial for capital punishment. The execution of James the Just, as recounted by Josephus (in his *Antiq.* xx. 9, 1), explains the martyrdom of Stephen and the subsequent threats against Paul's life (Acts xxiii. 30), and shows that a tumultuous occasion could lead to the infliction of capital punishment. (On the laws of punishment, comp. WINER, art. *Synedrium* [ii. 551, and SMITH, iii. 1136, art. *Sanhedrim*]).‡

* In the following section I have borrowed considerably from my own article on *Paul*, in HERZOG's *Real-Encyclopædie* [vol. xi. 1859, pp. 239-269.—P. S.]; but I have enlarged it according to necessity. Compare also the respective sections in the works of NEANDER, SCHAFF, LANGE, THIERSCH, on the *History of the Apostolic Church* (SCHAFF, pp 239-347), and CONYBEARE and HOWSON: *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul.* London, 1853, republished in New York.

† [The proper spelling is not *Sanhedrim*, but *Sanhedrin* (Talm. סַנְהֶדְרִין, formed from συνέδριον), but there is no uniformity in this even among scholars.—P. S.]

‡ [The reader will meet in this and all other parts of Dr. LANGE's *Commentary* very frequent references to WINER' *Biblical Dictionary* (*Biblisches Realwörterbuch zum Handgebrauch für Studirende*, etc., 3d ed. Leipsic, 1848, 2 vols.

Saul had already taken the lead in Jerusalem in the work of incarcerating the Christians but the apparent result of his efforts, which was only the wider promulgation of the gospel by means of the scattering of the congregation (Acts viii. 4), exasperated him still more. Therefore he solicited those fatal letters of authority which directed him toward Damascus. A proof of the confidence reposed in the fiery zeal of the young Pharisaic student may be seen in the fact that the Council not only gave him full authority, but also an obedient escort The enterprising youth designed to destroy the whole Christian flock in Damascus, and to drag back to Jerusalem even women, and all who were at his mercy.

But the Divine visitation came upon him when near Damascus. Saul, by a sudden miracle, became a Paul, as we are accustomed to say; the greatest and most dangerous of all the persecutors of the Christians (for he persecuted the Church in its infancy), was transformed into the greatest promulgator of Christianity in the world.

Paul was a descendant of the tribe of Benjamin, and a native of Tarsus, the polished and venerable capital of Cilicia, situated on the river Cydnus, the home of the great naturalist, Dioscorides, and of other distinguished men, and the burial place of Emperor Julian the Apostate. JEROME (*De viris illustrib.* cap. v.) mentions the report that Paul had emigrated with his parents from Gishala, but he afterwards declares, in his commentary on Philemon, that it is a fable. As the stock of Levi became gloriously resplendent in John the Baptist, so, under the new dispensation, did Benjamin, the son of Rachel, receive higher honor than any other tribe save Judah, which had previously risen to the greatest glory. And the same mighty energy which the blessing of Jacob ascribed to the character of Benjamin (Gen. xlix. 27), and which was confirmed by later events (Judges xx. 21), found its perfect expression in Paul. He was first a ravenous wolf in the midst of the flock that ate his prey in the morning; but in the evening he combined the strength of the wolf and the mildness of the lamb; and though he sprang like a wolf into the metropolitan cities of heathendom, his purpose was to "divide his spoil in the evening." His parents appear to have been in good circumstances. They were "Roman" citizens, though not as inhabitants of the city of Tarsus (for that city had not then obtained its freedom), but by special conditions with which we are not acquainted. Notwithstanding their high social standing, they strictly adhered to the Jewish faith, and designed their son to be a Pharisaic Rabbi. According to Jewish custom he had learned a trade; he was a tent-maker (that is, a weaver of a kind of cloth which was applied to tent-making; σκηνοποιός, Acts xviii. 3). The great talents of Saul could be early developed in the schools of cultivated Tarsus, if we may suppose that the rigid Pharisaic sentiment of his parents (which, however, was often mollified in heathen cities far away from Palestine) permitted him to visit those schools. From Paul's philosophic analysis of heathendom (Rom. i. and ii.), from his discourse at Athens (Acts xvii.), and from other similar expressions, we may very readily infer that his acquaintance with sentences of heathen philosophers and poets (Acts xvii. 28; Tit. i. 12 sq.), is not attributable to mere popular intercourse, but to reading and study. When in Jerusalem, he became familiarly acquainted with the Old Testament, rabbinical traditions and dialectics, and probably also with the doctrines of the Jewish Alexandrian school. It is probable that he found there some family connections; at least, he was subsequently supported very earnestly by a nephew (Acts xxiii. 16). As King Saul of old is said to have gone forth to seek she-asses, but found a crown, so with the Apostle; but he took better care of his crown.

The conversion of Saul is one of the greatest miracles of the exalted Saviour—one of the

which is justly prized in Germany as a masterwork of ripe scholarship and critical accuracy. The English and American student who has no access to it, may in nearly all such cases profitably consult the same articles in W. SMITH's *Dictionary of the Bible*, large edition, London and Boston, 1863, 3 vols.; large American edition, with many improvements and additions, by Prof. H. B. HACKETT and EZRA ABBOT, New York, 1868 ff., to be completed in 4 vols.; and the superb *third* edition of KITTO's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, prepared by W. LINDSAY ALEXANDER, D.D., etc., London, 1865, 3 vols. These English works, being the result of the combined labor of many contributors, have less unity and symmetry than that of WINER, but are more extensive and embody the latest information (especially HACKETT and ABBOT's edition of SMITH unabridged, now in course of preparation and publication, with the help of a number of American scholars). A new German Dictionary of the Bible has been recently commenced with a considerable array of collaborators by SCHENKEL of Heidelberg, and will represent the liberal, semi-rationalistic school of German theology —P. S.]

greatest miracles of conversion in the kingdom of grace. The fact especially that the most earnest zealot for Pharisaic legalism became, by Divine appointment, the chief apostle of a free gospel and faith, and the most successful destroyer of Pharisaism in Judaism, and in the Christian Church through all ages, is without a parallel in history. True, some of the greatest opponents of Jesuitism have come out of Jesuit schools. Luther, the former monk was the strongest antagonist of monastic righteousness; and Luther, the Augustinian, the strongest antagonist of intolerance, which St. Augustine unfortunately first established in theory in opposition to the Donatists; but not one of these contrasts reaches that miraculous transformation in which the glorified Christ, as with an ironical smile, changed the most formidable power of the enemy into His most victorious agency for conquest.

And yet this miracle, too, was conditioned by justice and truth. We must not ignore for the miraculous manifestation of Christ all connecting points of preparation in the unconscious spiritual life of Saul (as BAUMGARTEN has again done). This would be as partial and untenable as the opposite extreme of rationalistic writers, who vainly attempt to explain his conversion by psychological antecedents and extraordinary natural phenomena (see WINER, *Real-Wörterbuch*, art. *Paulus*). The history declares positively that the glorified Christ appeared to him; and we cannot interpret it in any other light. But Paul's own accounts show that the objective manifestation of Christ was mediated by a visionary or ecstatic elevation of Saul himself (Acts ix. 7; xxii. 9).

[The rationalistic interpretation, after having exploded in Germany, has been ingeniously renewed in France by E. RENAN, *Les Apôtres*, Paris, 1866, p. 181. There is a third view on the conversion of Paul, not mentioned by Dr. LANGE—the *mythical*—which resolves the event into a purely subjective process in Paul's own mind, and explains the supernatural light to be simply the symbolical expression of the certainty of the real spiritual presence of Christ in the Church and the believer. This view was ably defended by the late Dr. BAUR, of Tübingen, in his work on Paul, 1847, p. 68. But after a renewed investigation of the subject, the celebrated historian arrived at the conclusion that the conversion of Paul was an enigma, which cannot be satisfactorily solved by any psychological or dialectical analysis. See the second and revised edition of his work on Christianity and the Christian Church in the first three centuries, which appeared shortly before his death, a. 1860, p. 45, and the second edition of his *Paul*, edited by ZELLER, 1867. The character and apostolic life of Paul, and the very origin and continued existence of the Christian Church, is an inexplicable mystery without the miracle of the actual resurrection of our Saviour.—P. S.]

OBSERVATIONS.—1. On the splendor of the city of Tarsus in culture and institutions of learning, see WINER, article *Tarsus*. Also the particulars concerning *Gamaliel*, by the same author [and in KITTO's and W. SMITH's *Bible Dictionaries*].

2. On the life of Paul in general, compare the article *Paul* in the various Bible dictionaries; the relevant chapters in NEANDER, SCHAFF, THIERSCH, and LANGE, on the Apostolic Age; the work, *Die Biographien der Bibel*, Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1838; and REUSS, *Die Gesch. der heil. Schriften Neuen Testaments* [4th ed., 1864], p. 45 ff., where a comprehensive catalogue of literature may be found. For particular references, see below.

3. The literary education of the Apostle has been much discussed. Comp. NIEMEYER, *Charakteristik der Bibel*; THALEMANN's treatise, *De eruditione Pauli Judaica non Græca* (and WINER, *Real-Wörterbuch*, ii. 218). The parents of Paul may have been prevented, by their religious prejudices, from sending their son to the brilliant Grecian schools in Tarsus; but it does not therefore follow that the vigorous mind of the youthful Paul did not become acquainted privately with the principles of Grecian learning. Possibly his parents may have sent him to Jerusalem for the very reason that they discovered in him a dangerous susceptibility for the charms of Grecian literature.—"Paul received a learned Jewish education in the school of the Pharisæan Rabbi, Gamaliel, not remaining an entire stranger to Greek literature, as his style, his dialectic method, his allusions to heathen religion and philosophy, and his occasional quotations from heathen poets show. Thus, a 'Hebrew of the Hebrews,' yet at the same time a native Hellenist and a Roman citizen, he combined in himself, so to speak, the three great nationalities of the ancient world, and was endowed with all the natural qualifications for a universal apostleship. He could argue with the Pharisees as a son of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin, as a disciple of the renowned Gamaliel, surnamed 'the Glory of the Law,' and as one of the straitest of their sect. He could address the Greeks in

their own beautiful tongue, and with the force of their strong logic. Clothed with the dig nity and majesty of the Roman people, he could travel safely over the whole empire with the watchword: '*Civis Romanus sum.*'" From PH. SCHAFF, *History of Ancient Christianity*, vol. i. p. 68. Comp. also CHARLES HODGE, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, revised edition, first section of the Introduction: "His (Paul's) natural character was ardent, energetic, uncompromising, and severe. How his extravagance and violence were subdued by the grace of God, is abundantly evident from the moderation, mildness, tenderness, and conciliation manifested in all his epistles. Absorbed in the one object of glorifying Christ, he was ready to submit to any thing, and to yield any thing necessary for this purpose. He no longer insisted that others should think and act just as he did. So that they obeyed Christ, he was satisfied; and he willingly conformed to their prejudices, and tolerated their errors, so far as the cause of truth and righteousness allowed. By his early education, by his miraculous conversion and inspiration, by his natural disposition, and by the abundant grace of God, was this Apostle fitted for his work, and sustained under his multiplied and arduous labors."—P. S.]

4. On the chronology of the Apostle's life, see WINER, *Real-Wörterbuch*, ii. p. 217; WIESELER, *Chronology of the Apostolic Age* [Göttingen, 1848; also the Chronological Chart in the American edition of LANGE's *Commentary on Acts*, and ALFORD's *Commentary on Acts*, 5th ed., 1865, [pp. 22–27.—P. S.] On the various suppositions concerning the time of Paul's conversion, WINER, ii. p. 219.

5. On the conversion of the Apostle in particular, see the *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, chap. ix. [p. 161, Am. ed.] The objectivity of the appearance of Christ is there justly maintained. But we should, in addition to it, make proper account of the element of a vision as the *medium* of the appearance of Christ. Here belongs also the treatise of C. P. HOFSTEDE DE GROOT, *Pauli conversio, præcipuus theologiæ Paulinæ fons*, Groningen, 1855. ("*Itaque inveni principia gravissima tria, e quibus tota Pauli theologia est orta; primum mentis, Jesu vitam novam semper cogitantis, alterum animi, gratiam divinam constanter experti et sentientis, tertium vitæ, Christi ecclesiam perpetuo spectantis.*") Also the essay of PARET, *The Testimony of the Apostle Paul concerning the Appearance of Christ*, in the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol.*, vol. iv., pt. 2. For a full list of literature, see REUSS, l. c., p. 51, and WINER, ii. p. 214.

B. *The Preparation of Paul for the Apostolic Office, and his Apostolical Missionary Journeys to the time of his First Captivity in Rome.*

A man of such mighty genius, notwithstanding his apostolic call, was not qualified for an evangelist immediately after his conversion. His first zeal would have been too stormy, too powerful, and too much the outburst of immoderate excitement. After his first attempt in Damascus, he had to withdraw to Arabia for a quiet stay of about three years (Gal. i.)—a period over which a veil is drawn. He probably spent it, not in missionary labor, but to greater advantage in contemplative life, although he may have made some single missionary efforts during this time (see LANGE's *History of the Apost. Age*, ii. p. 124). After his first attempt in Jerusalem, also, where Barnabas introduced him to the apostles, Paul was again required to retire to private life. But this time he chose Cilicia, his native country. We may infer from his character that he did not remain absolutely passive, but that he occasionally testified of Christ; yet he did not engage in apostolic labors in their strictest sense.

Barnabas sent for him to come from Cilicia to Antioch, to coöperate with him in that newly-arisen metropolis of Gentile Christianity (Acts xi. 25). Paul entered into the most intimate relations with the congregation of Gentile Christians living there, and the destination that he had received at his call to become the Apostle to the Gentiles (Acts ix. 15), now approached its fulfilment. But it was in accordance with the apostolic spirit that the Gentile Church should remain in perfect unity with the Jewish-Christian Church. This tendency toward unity was strengthened by the first mission of Paul to Jerusalem, in company with Barnabas (Acts xi. 30). We may therefore consider this mission as the introduction to the apostolic labors of the Apostle; and since it also constitutes one of the strongest chronological links in his career, we will now speak of the chronological relations of his life.

We pass over, as unreliable points of connection, the government of Damascus by the Arabian king Aretas (Acts ix.; 2 Cor. xi. 32), and the meeting of Paul with Aquila in Corinth, in consequence of the banishment of the latter from Rome by an edict of the Empe

ror Claudius (see WIESELER, *Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters*, p. 167, and p. 125). The safest date at the beginning of the apostolic career of Paul is the year of the death of Herod Agrippa, A. D. 44 (JOSEPH., *De bello Jud.* ii. 11, 6); and the safest one at the end of the same is the recall of the procurator Felix from Judea in the year 60. The execution of James the Elder took place shortly before the death of Herod Agrippa (Acts xii. 2). About the same time, Paul and Barnabas went to Jerusalem as bearers of the collection taken at Antioch. If, according to the usual method, we reckon backward from this date, the year 44 (one year spent in Antioch, about one year in Jerusalem and Tarsus, three years in Arabia and Damascus), the conversion of Paul occurred about the year 39. Then, reckoning forward, let us fix the time of the Apostolic Council, under the supposition (which has been vainly contested)* that the journey described in Acts xv. is identical with that of Gal. ii. (see my *Gesch. des Apost. Zeitalters*, i. 99), and that the fourteen years which Paul reckons as occurring previous to this journey are to be numbered from his conversion. This being the case, the Apostolic Council occurred about the year 53.† The first missionary tour of the Apostle therefore took place between the years 44 or 45 and 52 or 53. The second and third were made between the years 53 and 59–60.

In reference to the more particular dates, compare the already mentioned work of WIESELER (whose parallel of Paul's journey mentioned in Acts xviii. 22, with that in Gal. ii., does not seem to be warranted); the article *Paul* in WINER; G. W. AGARDH, *Von der Zeitrechnung der Lebensgeschichte des Apostels Paulus*, etc., Stockholm, 1847. On the time of the ecstasy narrated in 2 Cor. xii. 7, compare my *Apost. Zeitalter*, ii. p. 8.

In regard to the credibility of the account of the Acts on the apostolic life of Paul, SCHNECKENBURGER maintained the hypothesis, that the author of that book converted the life of Paul from real historical materials into a parallel to the life of Peter. BAUR has outdone this hypothesis, and endeavored to carry out the hypercritical notion that the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles is an unhistorical production, written for the purpose of bringing about a compromise between Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity. On this vain attempt to convert the history of the Acts into a myth, or rather a conscious fiction, compare LECHLER, *The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Age*, p. 6 ff.

There was no doubt a gradual approach of the two sections of apostolic Christianity, in harmony with the first fundamental principle of the Word made flesh and the working of the spirit of the apostolic history. Conscious of the essential unity of faith and hope, the Gentile Church moved towards the Jewish Church, as the Jewish Church sought and found the Gentile Church. It is from this point of view that we must study Paul's journeys to Jerusalem as they alternated with his missionary tours. Every new missionary journey to the heathen world was followed by a renewal of the bond of union with the parent society in Jerusalem; and the more deeply the Apostle penetrated the heathen world, and the more fully he kept the Gentile Church free from Jewish ordinances, the more decidedly did he afterward show, by his own conduct in Jerusalem, his respect for Jewish customs. Only those who are unable, like Paul, to distinguish between dogmatic and ethical rules, can find a contradiction in this fact, and especially in the diversity of requirements between Gal. ii. 16 and Acts xv. 20.

The farthest limit of the first missionary tour of the Apostle was Derbe, in Lycaonia, Asia Minor. The appointment of Barnabas and Saul in Antioch by the direction of the Holy Spirit, their ordination by the united act of the congregation and its leaders, the voyage to Cyprus, the triumph of Paul over the false prophet Bar-jesus, his change of name, the journey to Pamphylia, and the return of Mark, the apostolic attendant, the missionary address of

* [By WIESELER who, in his very learned and able chronology of the Apostolic Age, identifies the visit mentioned, Gal. ii. 1, with the fourth journey of Paul to Jerusalem mentioned Acts xviii. 21, 22. He has defended his view in an Excursus to his *Commentary to the Galatians*, p. 552 ff. Compare against his view and in favor of the identity of the journey of Gal. ii. 1 with that to the Apostolic Council, Acts xv., my *History of the Apost. Church*, p. 245 ff.; and the Commentary on Gal. ii. 1.—P. S.]

† [The chronologists of the Apostolic Church differ in the date of the Council of Jerusalem from 47–53. WINER, DE WETTE, WIESELER, SCHAFF, and ALFORD, put it in 50 or 51; OLSHAUSEN, MEYER, EWALD, in 52.—P. S.]

the Apostle in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia, the persecutions on the part of the Jews in Antioch and Iconia, Paul's miracle at Lystra, and his success in Derbe: these are the prominent points of the first missionary tour. We must observe especially, 1, That the apostolic men at that time, as well as later, always directed their first attention to the Jews, and consequently entered the synagogue, although at Antioch, in Pisidia, an important crisis occurred in their zeal for Gentile missions (Acts xiii. 46); 2. that Paul, the younger messenger, appears more and more decidedly in the foreground; 3. that on their return the societies of converts were organized into fixed congregations, especially by the appointment of elders (Acts xiv. 23); 4. that the free spirit with which Paul carried on the missionary work among the Gentiles produced, in all probability, that reaction of the more rigid Jewish Christians which led to the first Apostolic Council, and Paul's journey to Jerusalem in connection therewith; 5. that the enmity of the Jews against the preaching of the two men, especially of Paul, became more intense from his expulsion (in Antioch) to the attempt to stone him (in Iconium), and to his real stoning (in Lystra).

On the change of Paul's name, various views have been advanced (see WINER, article *Paul;* SCHAFF, *History of the Apost. Church*, p. 226; comp. Com. on Ch. i. 1.). We are of the opinion that Saul, as a Roman citizen, was already in possession of a Roman name, but that, while at Cyprus, he was induced, not only by the friendship of Sergius Paulus, but especially by his antagonism to the false prophet who called himself Elymas the Sorcerer, the *mighty magician*, to term himself, as that man's conqueror in the name of the Lord, Paul the *small man* (so far as David's victory over Goliath had repeated itself here in a New Testament character); and particularly, also, because the Apostle, being now about to enter into active intercourse with the Grecian and Roman world, could travel more conveniently under a Roman name.

The second missionary journey passes over Asia Minor to Europe, and finds its farthest limit in Corinth. It is specially characterized by the following events: (1.) The separation of Paul and Barnabas on account of Mark, and the beginning of a separate and independent mission of Paul, in which he was followed at first by Silas, and later by Timothy and Luke; (2.) the tour of visitation into the earlier missionary field (Cyprus being passed over, and left to the care of Barnabas), which was changed into a new mission of colossal proportions; (3.) the harmonization of the body of Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians by means of the *ethical* principles established by the Church in Jerusalem (Acts xvi. 4); (4.) the new stations: Cilicia (before the repeated visit of the elder stations), then Phrygia, Galatia, Troas; after this in Europe: Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, Corinth; also the persecutions, which varied in strength in proportion to the greater or less results of the preaching of the gospel; (5.) the miraculous aid and manifestation of the Spirit, which led Paul to Europe (Acts xvi. 6, 7, 9); (6.) the contrast between the ministrations of the Apostle in Athens and in Corinth; but we err if we suppose that Paul corrected his learned discourse in Athens by his exclusive preaching of the Cross in Corinth; (7.) the meeting of Paul with Aquila and Priscilla in Corinth, which so greatly affected his subsequent mission; (8.) the longer stay of the Apostle in Corinth, and the importunities of the Jews against him in the presence of the deputy, Gallio; (9.) the new journey of the Apostle to Jerusalem for the accomplishment of a vow, during which he touches at Ephesus, and there makes preparation for his mission by leaving behind Aquila and Priscilla.

The third missionary tour is so far an enlargement of the second, as that Paul at this time makes Ephesus, in Asia Minor, his great object, which city he had been compelled to pass by in his journey, and which he could only touch at on his return. Apollos was his pioneer here, and the silversmith Demetrius became his principal opponent. His victory was, on the one hand, a triumph over the nocturnal magic of this city dedicated to Diana, the goddess of the Moon; and, on the other, over idolatry. This journey, which was at first supplementary in its design, assumed the character of a visitation; for Paul departed from Ephesus, and again visited the congregations in Macedonia and Greece. The supposition of a third missionary visit to the Corinthian church between the second and third missionary tours has

been shown, in a variety of ways, to rest upon a misunderstanding (see my *Apost. Age*, i p. 199). The third missionary journey is characterized by the more decided prominence of the missionary calculation and self-determination of the Apostle (see 1 Cor. xvi. 5; 2 Cor. i. 15); by his miraculous works, especially in Ephesus and Troas (Acts xviii. 11; xx. 10); by the establishment of a metropolis of the church of Asia Minor, which was destined to become the home of John, and the maternal city of Christian speculation; by the founding of a larger association and Pauline school; and finally, by the decided premonition of his captivity which the Apostle felt, as he drew his missionary journey to a close, and entered upon his pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

The performance of a Nazarite vow in Jerusalem (a step counselled by James) grew, from a measure of accommodation to the narrow views of the Jewish Christians, into an offence on the part of the Jews. It led to the persecution of the Apostle in Jerusalem, his abduction and imprisonment in Cæsarea, his appeal to the judgment-seat of Cæsar, and his transportation to Rome (in the year 62; according to AUGER and WINER, in the spring of 61). From this captivity he was released (in the year 64), not only according to the testimony of tradition (EUSEB., ii. 22: λόγος ἔχει, CYRILL. HIEROS., HIERONYMUS, etc.; see WINER), but also according to certain hints of the Scriptures, yet only, after a new journey for missions and visitation, to fall into a second imprisonment, and to suffer martyrdom under Nero.

OBSERVATIONS.—1. For a statement of relevant literature, see REUSS, l. c., p. 54, 55, 56 sqq. [SMITH, *Dict. of the B.*, art. *Paul*, at the close, vol. iii. 763).

2. Ananias at Damascus, a predecessor of Barnabas for the introduction of Paul into the Church of Christ, as Stephen had been a predecessor of Paul himself.

3. Paul's three years of instruction in the quiet solitude of Arabia, a counterpart and parallel to the three years of instruction spent by the twelve apostles in intercourse with the Lord. The latter was an external and historical communion; that of Paul was undoubtedly of a mysterious and internal character, and kindred to the great mysterious fact of his conversion. See my *Apost. Age*, ii. p. 123. [SCHAFF, *H. of the Ap. Ch.* p. 236; and Com. on Gal. i. 17.]

4. The development of the Apostle's consciousness of his specific call to the Gentiles was gradual, and commensurate with the gradual definiteness of his call to the apostolic office in general. This may be seen from Acts ix. 15, 29; comp. xxii. 21; xiii. 46; xix. 9; xxviii. 17 sqq.; Gal. ii. But this call to the Gentiles did not exclude a purpose to convert the Jews; for not only must he first seek in the synagogues those heathen who were susceptible hearers of his message, especially the proselytes of the gate (Acts xiii. 48), but Paul also recognized the conversion of the Gentiles, apart from their personal salvation, as a means for the conversion of Israel (Rom. xi. 13, 14). The gradual development of his apostolic knowledge by virtue of continued revelations and illuminations, was not precluded by the Apostle's preparation, derived from a historical knowledge of the Holy Scriptures and of the life of Jesus, and by his great miraculous illumination when his call occurred.

5 On the person of Barnabas; on Cilicia, Antioch, Asia Minor, etc., see the relevant articles in the Biblical dictionaries. Also the introductions to the respective parts of this Commentary. On Antioch in particular, see my *Apost. Age*, ii. p. 158.

6. The reciprocal action between the three missionary journeys of the Apostle, and his pilgrimage to Jerusalem at the close of each of these journeys, are in themselves sufficient to overthrow as an untenable fiction BAUR's hypothesis above alluded to.

7. On the identity of the fact related in Gal. ii. with that narrated in Acts xv., see REUSS, p. 55, and SCHAFF's *History of the Apost. Church*, p. 245 ff.

8. The relation of the apostolic deliberations in Acts xv. to the so-called Noachian commands, is also maintained by REUSS, l. c., p. 56. See thereon my *Apost. Age*, ii. p. 184. REUSS maintains that Acts xv. 21 avows the validity of the law for the Jewish Christians. But the absence of all *dogmatic* obligation in the same passage is very plain from the transactions of the apostolic council. Yet, as far as the national and ethical validity of the same is concerned, it was in perfect harmony with the apostolic spirit that the continuance of the law should not be violently abrogated. For the relevant literature, see REUSS, p. 56.

9. For a catalogue of the friends and followers of the Apostle, see the same, p. 58.

10. The Apostle's missionary method and policy: (1.) A prudent adjustment of his universal mission to the Gentile world, even to Rome, and the western limit of the Old World (Spain), to the primitive historical trunk of Christianity in Jerusalem—that is, the incorporation of the missionary spirit with the vital power of the Church. (2.) Perception of the historical links for communicating the gospel to the world. Therefore he first turned his

attention to the Jews, and rose in their synagogues, but made full account of the prejudices of the Jews, and the receptibility of the heathen for Christianity. Therefore he embraced in his view, and also seized upon, the points of connection in the Gentile world (see his address at Athens on the inscription of an altar), and with equal clearness he discovered and opposed all real barriers to the truth (righteousness by works among the Jews; luxurious life in Corinth, 1 Cor. i. 2; and the gloomy sorcery of superstition in Ephesus). (3.) Most careful observance of Divine guidance to go forward or to hold back (Acts xvi. 6, 9; xxv. 10; Rom. i. 13, etc.). (4.) Careful consolidation of his missionary work, by instituting congregational offices, and the organization of congregations (Acts xiv. 22, 23), and promoting the inner unity of the churches by their community of prayer and love (see especially the Epistle to the Philippians). (5.) A comprehensive and free use of all chosen companions in faith for coöperation in the form of helpers, evangelists, messengers, and pioneers in a general sense. He is surrounded by his helpers; he sends them out upon new paths; he leaves them behind in churches already organized. That they may be strengthened and encouraged, the spirits of the gospel come and go in his presence, just as the messengers come and go at the court of a prince; he sets all the powers of faith in motion, in order to set all the world in motion. (6.) He greatly advances the personal usefulness of himself and of his coadjutors, by his apostolical epistles. (7.) The marvellous concentration, development, and elaboration of his doctrine in a manner adapted to the necessities of the congregations, and in perfect harmony with a most careful preservation of the fundamental character of his doctrine. The rock-like steadfastness and adherence to the doctrine of free grace, united with that most faithful development which is exhibited also in his style as a progressive creative power, producing a rich treasure of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα. (8.) The supplementing of his burning activity by sacred retreats, when he sank even into the depths of visionary contemplation; likewise his union of apostolic consecration to the demand of the moment (see his Epistle to Philemon) with his all-embracing care for the whole Church and for its whole future.

11. On the three missionary tours and the life of the Apostle, and the particular events of the same, compare the Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, and the well-known works of NEANDER, SCHAFF, THIERSCH, and EWALD, on the Apostolic Age, and the literature referred to by REUSS, p. 59 sqq.

C. *The Second Imprisonment and the Martyrdom of Paul.*

The second imprisonment has been lately discarded even by theologians who accept the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles, such as WIESELER, EBRARD, SCHAFF, THIERSCH (see my *Apost. Age*, ii. p. 374). Yet we still hold to the testimony of the old ecclesiastical tradition for the following reasons: (1.) Because the Acts of the Apostles concludes at the time when the first imprisonment of Paul must have come to an end, without taking any cognizance of his death; (2.) because the Apostle himself, about the end of this period, anticipated his deliverance (Phil. ii. 24); (3.) because the Pastoral Epistles—whose Pauline character cannot be doubted if we take into the account an advanced development of Christianity of some years' duration—cannot be comprehended in the early career of Paul down to the year 64, without great violence; and the same is the case still more with the Apostle's stay in Crete (Tit. i.); (4.) because the development of the germs of Ebionism and Judaizing Gnosticism, which are taken cognizance of in the Pastoral Epistles, is clearly indicated by the Epistles of the Apostle written some years earlier, during his imprisonment from 62 to 64, but had not gained the strength which they possessed at the time when the Pastoral Epistles were composed; (5.) because the tradition of the Church distinguishes positively between the judicial execution of Peter and Paul, and the first great persecution of the Christians as a body under Nero; (6.) the testimony of the Roman Clement (1 Cor. v.), that Paul came ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, having been written in Rome, cannot refer to Rome, and supports the tradition, harmonizing with the purpose of the Apostle (Rom. xv. 24), that Paul visited Spain after his deliverance (comp. my *Apost. Age*, ii. p. 386).*

* [The passage of Clement of Rome, which has given rise to different interpretations, must be translated thus "Paul . . . having come to the *limit* (ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα, not: *before the highest tribunal*, ὑπὸ τὸ τέρμα) of the West, and having died a martyr under the rulers (others: having borne witness before the rulers), he departed from the world and went to the holy place, having furnished the sublimest model of endurance." The dispute about the true reading in the passage (somewhat obliterated)—ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα or ὑπὸ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως—is now settled in favor of ἐπί by the testimony of Professors JACOBSON and TISCHENDORF, who have carefully re-examined the only extant and defective MS. of the

If we may judge from intimations in the Pastoral Epistles, Paul hastened, after his deliverance, first to Ephesus, where the Christian truth was threatened by the first development of Christian heresy. We cannot decide whether he was permitted to visit Jerusalem once more on this journey, as was anticipated by the Epistle to the Hebrews, and might be expected from the three visits of his earlier missionary tours. From Ephesus he went to Macedonia and Greece; then over Troas and Miletus to Crete. Afterwards he proceeded to Epirus, where he spent the winter in Nicopolis, and subsequently left Titus. He then directed his course westward, to the τέρμα τῆς δύσεως, where he was probably seized and taken a prisoner to Rome, before being able to found another permanent organization [in Spain].* Meanwhile, Peter either came or was brought to Rome, and both suffered martyrdom there together (according to Clement of Rome, Irenæus, Tertullian, etc.; see the article *Peter*, in HERZOG's *Real-Encyclopædie*). The Roman Church celebrates the death of Peter and Paul on the same day—the 29th of June.

[The views on the year of Paul's martyrdom vary from 64 to 68. This question depends, of course, mainly on the question of the second captivity. WIESELER contends for the year 64, shortly *before* the great Neronian persecution (the only one properly authenticated by historical evidence), which broke out, according to Tacitus, *Annal.*, xv. 44, in consequence of the conflagration, July 19th, 64; but the general tradition of the Church connects Paul's and Peter's martyrdom with this persecution, which probably gave rise to several isolated executions afterwards. If we adopt the hypothesis of a second imprisonment, we may arrive at a more definite result by referring the ἡγούμενοι in the famous passage of Clemens Rom. (1 Cor. v., μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, *sub præfectis martyrium subiens*), either (with HUG, *Intr.* ii. 323, HEFELE, *Patres Apost.*, p. 61, 4th ed., and DÖLLINGER) to Tigellinus and Nymphidius Sabinus, or (with PEARSON) to Helius Cæsarianus and Polycletus, who in the last years of Nero, especially during his absence in Greece, A. D. 67, had charge of the government in Rome. In this case we get the year 67 or 68 for the martyrdom of Paul; and this agrees with the Catholic tradition based upon EUSEBIUS and JEROME (who, in his *Catal. Script.*, says most explicity of Paul: "*Hic ergo decimo quarto Neronis anno—i. e.*, A. D. 68—*eodem die quo Petrus Romæ pro Christo capite truncatus sepultusque est, in Via Ostiensi*). The Basilica of St. Paul, in commemoration of his martyrdom, now stands outside the walls of Rome (*San Paolo fuori de' muri*), on the road to Ostia, and the Porta Ostiensis is called the gate of St. Paul. The traditional spot of his martyrdom, however, is a little distance from the Basilica, where there are three chapels, called ***The Three Fountains*** (***Tre Fontane***), in commemoration of the legend that three fresh fountains miraculously gushed forth from the blood of Paul's head as it was cut off by the executioner, and leaped three times from the ground

Clementine Epistle to the Corinthians in the British Museum. See JACOBSON, *Patres Apost. in loc.* (Oxon., new ed., 1863), and TISCHENDORF, *Appendix codicum celeb. Sin. Vat. Alex.*, etc., Lips. 1867. This sets aside WIESELER's interpretation of τέρμα—supreme power, highest tribunal of the West (*i. e.*, the Emperor of Rome), into which I myself was betrayed in my *History of the Apostolic Church*, p 342 (Am. ed.), and which I now retract. Although τέρμα in itself may mean supreme power, it can hardly do so in connection with the geographical term δύσις. At all events ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως must here be rendered: *to the limit of the West;* and this, in the mouth of Clement who wrote from Rome, points more naturally, though by no means necessarily, to Spain (or Gaul or Britain) than to Rome, especially in view of the fact that Paul *intended* to visit Spain, Rom. xv. 24 ff. Clement therefore may be quoted with tolerably good reason as the first witness to the ancient tradition (first *clearly* stated by EUSEBIUS, *H. E.* ii. 25: λόγος ἔχει, etc.) of a second Roman captivity of Paul; for before his first captivity there is no room for a journey to Spain.—P. S.]

* [There is not the slightest historical trace of the labors of Paul in Spain, much less in Britain. The early tradition of his journey to Spain is inferred from Clement's τέρμα τῆς δύσεως, and seems to be obscurely implied in the mutilated Muratori fragment on the Canon; but it may have originated in a premature conclusion from the Apostle's desire to visit that country, Rom. xv. 24, 28. Nevertheless such a journey, which was certainly intended, may have been executed, and rendered comparatively fruitless by difficulties thrown in his way, or by a speedy return. EWALD (*Apost. Zeitalter*, 2d ed., 1858, p. 631) suggests that Paul, on hearing in Spain of the terrors of the Neronian persecution, hastened of his own accord back to Rome to bear testimony to Christ, and being seized there, was again brought to trial and condemned to death in 65. HOWSON (*The Life and Letters of St. Paul*, ii. 460 ff., 482 ff.; Lond. ed.), in following and extending the combinations of NEANDER, assumes that Paul, after his liberation in 63, first visited the East (Philem. ver 22; Phil. ii. 24), then Spain by an unknown route, after about two years again returned to the East (Ephesus, Macedonia, Crete) was arrested at Nicopolis, forwarded to Rome for a second trial, probably on the charge of having instigated the Roman Christians to their supposed act of incendiarism (?) which caused the terrible persecution in 64, and suffered martyrdom early in June, 68, shortly before the death of Nero.—P. S.]

("*abscisso Pauli capite triplici saltu sese sustollente*," *Acta Sanct.*, vol. vii., sub June 29th.) This legend is less credible than the beautiful legend connected with Peter's death and perpetuated in the little church of *Domine quo vadis*, on the Appian Way. Comp., on Paul's death and martyrdom, my *History of the Apost. Church;* CONYBEARE and HOWSON, vol. ii. 502 ff. (Lond. ed.); also PRUDENTIUS, *Peristeph. Hymnus XII.;* BUNSEN, *Beschreibung Roms*, iii. p. 440; ALFRED VON REUMONT, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom* (Berlin, 1867), vol. i. p. 374 f.--P. S.]

OBSERVATIONS.—1. On the treatises for and against the second captivity of Paul, see WINER, *Real-Lexic.*, ii. p. 221, and SCHAFF, *Hist. of the Apost. Church*, § 87, pp. 328–343. The second captivity is also advocated by the work of L. RUFFET, *Saint Paul; sa double captivité à Rome.* Paris, 1860; and by GAMS, *Das Jahr des Martyrtodes der Apostel Petrus and Paulus*, Regensburg, 1867. He puts the martyrdom of Peter in the year 65; that of Paul in the year 67. [VAN OOSTERZEE (*Com. on the Pastoral Epistles*), EWALD (*History of Israel*, vol. vi., or *Hist. of the Apost. Age*, 2d ed. of 1858), BLEEK (*Introd. to the N. T.*, 1862), HUTHER (*Com. on the Epp. to Timothy and Titus* in MEYER'S *Com.*, 3d ed. 1866), CONYBEARE and HOWSON, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, WORDSWORTH, and most of the English commentators on Paul, likewise favor the second Roman captivity. (WORDSWORTH, in the interest of Anglicanism, defends even Paul's journey to Britain as well as to Spain). On the other hand, C. W. OTTO (in his learned and astute work, *Die historischen Verhältnisse der Pastoralbriefe*, Lips. 1860), NIEDNER (*Kirchengeschichte*, 1866, p. 114), MEYER (*Rom.* p. 13 ff.), and again WIESELER (in his learned article on the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, in the last supplementary vol. of HERZOG'S *Encycl.*, 1866, vol. xxi. p. 276 ff.), oppose the hypothesis of a second Roman captivity of Paul. *Adhuc sub judice lis est.*—P. S.]

2. Further on the necessity of admitting a second captivity of Paul, see in the *Bible-Work, The Pastoral Epistles*, by Dr. VAN OOSTERZEE, 2d ed., Introduction (Am. ed. vol. viii.), and my *Apost. Zeitalter*, ii. p. 386. Critical prejudices are often propagated, while the original motives and reasons are lost sight of, although such reasons, sprung, as they frequently are, from original misconceptions, have lost their apparent importance in the course of time. For example, the criticism against the second part of Zechariah has very clearly arisen from a misunderstanding. Thus many negations in the department of New Testament exegesis have arisen from some caprice of SCHLEIERMACHER, some fancy of DE WETTE, some rationalistic short-sightedness or some fixed idea of BAUR, produced by the Hegelian theory of an officious construction of history.

[The question of the second Roman captivity of Paul is simply a historical problem, which has no doctrinal or ethical bearing, and which, in the absence of sufficient data, can never be solved with mathematical certainty. Those who, like WIESELER, THIERSCH, NIEDNER, OTTO, and others, hold fast to the Pauline origin of the Pastoral Epistles, lose nothing by denying a second captivity and trial; they save the whole extent of Paul's *known* labors, and only compress them into a smaller number of years, thus intensifying rather than diminishing his activity. It must be admitted, however, that the hypothesis of a second captivity offers a considerable advantage in the defence and exposition of the Pastoral Epistles; for it is much more difficult to find a suitable place *before* than *after* the first Roman captivity of Paul for the composition of these epistles, and a number of historical facts therein assumed (such as a missionary journey of Paul to Crete, Tit. i. 5; a visit to Troas, 2 Tim. iv. 13; a pretty advanced state in the development of church organization, and of heresy, 1 Tim. iii.-vi.), and to understand their farewell tone and general spirit, as compared with the earlier writings of the Apostle.—P. S.]

D. *The Character of the Apostle.*

The character of the Apostle reflects itself in his work, as in his Epistles, and appears before us in the energetic and harmonious contrasts of a great apostolic spirit. He was as frank in his deep humility as the sincerest penitent (Phil. iii. 6), and equally joyous in his acclamations over the all-prevailing faith unto salvation (2 Cor. xii. 10); steadfast in adherence to his convictions (Gal. i. 16), and at the same time cautious, considerate, and master of the finest and purest policy (Acts xxiii. 6, 7); full of enthusiasm, able to speak wondrously in tongues, and to rise to visionary and ecstatic states of mind (1 Cor. xiv. 18 comp. my *Apost. Zeitalter*, i. p. 199 sqq.), and yet unwearied in active practical labors; speculative, profound, and at the same time a man of the people and a servant of the congregation; heroically strong and outspoken, and yet as tender and refined in feeling and taste as a virgin (comp. his Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon); eagle-like in his universal

view and work, but not less considerate in his regard and care for the smallest details; an imperious and commanding character, and yet the most dutiful servant of the Church; a cultivated rabbinical theologian, and at the same time a modest workman at a trade; burning in his love for the Lord and his brethren, and for this very reason overpowering in his moral indignation and rebuke of all that was opposed to the honor of his Master; a great Jew inflamed by a tragic sympathy with the Jewish people (Rom. ix. 2 ff., comp. 2 Cor. xii. 7), and nevertheless the most bitter opponent of all Pharisæism, old and new; of all the apostles the most hated, and yet the most beloved and popular; the most misinterpreted and misconceived (by Antinomians, Marcionites, Paulicians, etc.), and at the same time the most studied and expounded. Thus Paul has developed the most magnificent life of a hero, whom the world could neither bend nor conquer, but whom Christ overcame with a miraculous glance of his glorious revelation. (Comp. SCHAFF's *Hist. of the Apost. Church*, p. 441 f.)

Concerning the apostolic position of Paul, two points are to be observed in particular. First of all is the fact that he did not belong to the apostles of the first foundation of Christianity, but that he was charged with the apostolate of the first historical growth and expansion of Christianity into a universal character as the religion of the whole human race. He therefore has become, in an emphatic sense, the Apostle of evangelical reform in all succeeding periods of the Church. Secondly, the great opposition presented by the Pauline apostolate to all external legalism and stagnation in Christianity, is expressly declared in his call. He was not of the number of the historical disciples, witnesses, and chosen ones of the historical Christ; not a member of the apostolic college established by Christ during his pilgrimage on earth. Hurled down as an enemy by the risen Lord in a heavenly vision, he arose at once as a witness of faith and as one of the apostles, and received his apostolic authority only in heavenly voices from the Church (Acts ix. 15); in his visions (Acts xxii. 21); in his commission from Antioch, the mother church of Gentile Christianity; in the living epistles which the Holy Spirit wrote in the form of vigorous churches of his planting (2 Cor. iii. 2 ff.); and in the decided recognition by the first apostles of the Lord (Acts xv.; Gal. ii.).

His apostolate remained doubtful to a great number of traditional Jewish Christians; the most rigid Jewish Christians rejected it, and persecuted him; and the later Ebionites loaded his memory with scorn, as an errorist and a heretic. The legalistic Christianity of the Middle Ages, while professing the highest respect for the name of Paul, has persecuted his doctrines as they have been exhibited in the principles of the Reformation, in the form of Jansenism, in the history of Port Royal, and in many other ways. Even in the Protestant evangelical Church there obtains a legalistic high-churchism, which, while it adheres to external legitimacy, traditionalism, and legalism, is opposed to the principles of Christianity, and especially to the apostolate and doctrine of Paul.

But, on the other hand, the antinomianism of all Christian ages has been based on a misunderstanding and misinterpretation of his doctrines. Amid these opposite extremes, there courses the mighty stream of pure blessings with which the Lord, by His Spirit, has sealed the testimony of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, and with which He will seal it to the end of time.

Thus Paul will still maintain his position with the other apostles in the Church of Christ. Yet we would not deny the measure of truth in the view of SCHELLING, that, as far as the prevailing type of the Church is concerned, the Petrine Church of the Middle Ages was followed by the Pauline Church of Protestantism, and that the perfection will hereafter appear in the Church of the Johannean type. It would be a great misunderstanding, however, to conceive of this type as a syncretism of Judaizing legalism and Pauline freedom. The higher synthesis of the genuine Petrine and the genuine Pauline theology can only be found in the deeper ideal development of the revelation of the law and the Spirit, as set forth by John.

OBSERVATIONS.—1. The *natural disposition* of the Apostle must be characterized as an even harmony of various temperaments and gifts in genial fulness and strength, and inspired by a heroic energy and vitality of soul. By virtue of this energetic vitality the same man could always remain consistent and true, and yet become all things to all men; he could

stand and shine first in this and then in that pole of his wonderful endowments; at this moment in ecstasy, at the next as a practical man of action; now reminding us of the contemplativeness of a John, then of the fiery energy of a Peter; now musically lyrical in style, then acutely dialectical even to the subtlest distinctions; though possessing a tragical national sympathy for his people in his heart—the depth where his natural melancholy was reflected and transformed—he was as susceptible of joyous sentiments as a child, or rather as a man in Christ, in whom the freshest impulses of a sanguine temper were consecrated to God. And how powerful he was in holy indignation and wrath! If the phlegmatic temperament consisted in cold indifference and dulness of spirit, Paul would be entirely free from it; but if we understand by it a natural disposition to perseverance, and tough tenacity, we must see that in this respect also he was richly endowed. His endowments reciprocally equalized and attempered themselves in his person as *charismata*, or gifts of the Spirit, as he himself desired (1 Cor. xii.) that all the various endowments should harmonize and concentrate in the Church.

2. The rich *literature* in connection with Paul and his theology is enumerated in the bibliographical works of WALCH (*Bibl. Theol.*, iv. p. 662 sqq.); WINER (*Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, i. p. 252 ff., pp. 294, 567; Supplement, p. 39); DANZ (*Universalwörterbuch der theolog. Literatur*, p. 740 ff.; Supplement, p. 30); in the well-known Introductions to the New Testament [by DE WETTE, CREDNER, REUSS, BLEEK, GUERICKE, DAVIDSON], as well as the appropriate commentaries. Besides, we must also compare the works on the Apostolic Age by NEANDER, SCHAFF, THIERSCH, LANGE, LECHLER, RITSCHL, EWALD; also the works [of SCHMIDT, VAN OOSTERZEE, etc.] on the Biblical theology of the New Testament. Against BAUR's *Apostle Paul* [2d edition, by ZELLER, 1867, in 2 vols.] is especially directed the work of LECHLER, already referred to [also, in great part, WIESELER, on the *Chronology of the Apost. Age*]. Of the many *practical* works on the Apostle Paul, we may mention: MENKEN, *Glances into the Life of the Apostle Paul and the First Christian Congregation* (Bremen, 1828); AD. MONOD, *The Apostle Paul*, Five Sermons (2d ed., German, Elberfeld, 1858 [also in English]); NAUMANN, *Paulus—The First Victories of Christianity* (Leipzig); BESSER, *Paul* (Leipzig, 1861); M. KÄHLER, *Paul, the Servant and Messenger of Jesus of Nazareth* (Halle, 1862); OSWALD, *The Missionary Work of Paul* (2d ed., Stuttg., 1864); HAUSRATH (semi-rationalistic), *The Apostle Paul* (Heidelberg, 1865). The life of the great Apostle has also been illustrated by poems, songs, and dramas. [Of English works, besides those already mentioned, PALEY's *Horæ Paulinæ*, Lord LYTTLETON on the *Conversion of St. Paul*, and JAMES SMITH's *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul* (London, 1848), deserve special mention as illustrating particular points, and strongly corroborating the historical character of the Acts and the Epistles. The instructive and entertaining descriptive work of CONYBEARE and HOWSON is generally known in America as well as in England, and admirably adapted for the theological lay reader. Comp. also the literature at the close of the article *Paul* in SMITH's *Dictionary of the Bible*.—P. S.]

§ 3. THE EPISTLES OF PAUL.

A. *Their Historical Order.*

If we except the Pastoral Letter of the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem about the year 53 [50], the two Epistles to the Thessalonians are the oldest New Testament epistles. They were written from Corinth in the year 54 or 55, not long after the establishment of the congregation, and in consequence of the chiliastic excitement of the same during the second missionary journey of the Apostle. The Epistle to the Galatians was written about 56–57, in Ephesus, during the third missionary journey. The two Epistles to the Corinthians were written by Paul from Ephesus and Macedonia, about the year 58; and soon afterwards, about the year 59, he composed the Epistle to the Romans, from Corinth. Between the years 62–64, if not a little earlier, the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon were written; and toward the close of the first Roman captivity, the Epistle to the Philippians. A little later still, the Epistle to the Hebrews proceeded from the company of Paul, about contemporaneously with the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles. The First Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus must be assigned to the interval between the first and second captivity, 64–66. The last of the Pauline Epistles, the Second to Timothy, was written about the year 67. As to the untenableness of the hypothesis of a Third Epistle to the Corinthians, as well as of an Epistle to the Laodiceans, different from the Epistle to the Ephesians, comp. my *Apost. Zeitalter*, i. p. 205 [and Dr. WING, in *Com. on 2 Corinthians*, p. 7 – P. S.].

OBSERVATIONS.—1. Compare the Introductions to the commentaries on the various Pauline Epistles.

2. Several critics (SCHULZ, SCHNECKENBURGER, SCHOTT, WIGGERS, THIERSCH, REUSS, MEYER, SCHENKEL) are of the opinion that the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, and that to Philemon, were written during the captivity of Paul at Cæsarea. The principal argument is made to lie in the circumstances relating to the slave Onesimus, who ran away from his master. Onesimus, it is assumed, could more easily have escaped from Colosse to the neighboring Cæsarea, than to distant Rome. But why did not, then, Onesimus flee to some place which lay still nearer at hand? We could well imagine that a slave in Colosse would have a more decided disposition to escape to the world's metropolis—the refuge of fortune-seekers and adventurers—than to Cæsarea. Besides, in a sea-voyage it makes little difference whether the distance be long or short. It is easier for a German fugitive to flee by sea to America, than by land to Spain. All remarks on the probably greater expenses of the voyage to Rome, and on the probably greater strictness in Rome, are as inconclusive as the principal argument. The other argument is derived from the following circumstance: If Tychicus, according to the usual supposition, had made the journey from Rome to Colosse with Onesimus, then the two travellers must first have arrived at Ephesus. But now the Apostle, in Eph. vi. 21, where he recommends Tychicus to the Ephesians, makes no mention of Onesimus, while the same Onesimus is mentioned and heartily recommended, Col. iv. 9. But the latter fact admits of a simple explanation. The poor Onesimus was at home in Colosse, and must now be received as a Christian by the congregation there. To this end he certainly needed the recommendation of the Apostle. But of what use could be the recommendation of the Colossian slave to the Ephesian church, for which he had no signification whatever? If we maintain that the Epistle to the Ephesians was an encyclical letter to those congregations of Asia Minor which were subsequently grouped definitely in a cycle, then the strange assumption that Onesimus must have been introduced to all the seven churches, will appear still more strange. In the first argument we miss all traces of the sea-breeze; in the second, all evidence of apostolic decorum. Moreover, it would be very difficult to prove that the way from Cæsarea must have led by Colosse to Ephesus, and not *vice-versâ*, if one will only remember the advantages of a sea-voyage. We will direct attention to only one of the reasons for the composition of the already-mentioned Epistles in Rome. The Apostle, before his imprisonment, Rom. i. 10, had informed the Romans that he was just then about to come to them;—now, should he have forgotten this solemn promise in Cæsarea, under delusive hopes of a speedy deliverance, and engaged lodgings among the Colossians (Philemon, ver. 22)? But the chief argument, in our opinion, lies in the very advanced development of the churches of Asia Minor both in sin and righteousness, as it is reflected in those Epistles. Such a development presupposes at least a period of from three to four years.

B. *Their Contents.*

Every Epistle of the Apostle bears the imprint of a historical occasion, by which the contents of the same are shaped.

The congregation at Thessalonica was misled, amid its persecutions, into a chiliastic excitement; hence the Epistles addressed to it partake of an *eschatological* character.

The Epistle to the Galatians is chiefly *soteriological*, or an exposition of the righteousness of faith, in opposition to the Judaistic righteousness of works, which was urged by the false Galatian teachers.

The Epistle to the Romans is also *soteriological*, but in view of the more general antagonism between grace and the righteousness of faith, to the general corruption which we observe in the mutual self-boasting of heathen Christians and Jewish Christians.

The Epistles to the Corinthians possess an *ecclesiastical* character, since the First Epistle indicates the true Church, with *polemical* reference to the disturbances and corruptions in the life of the congregation; while the Second establishes the true ministerial office, in *apologetic* self-defence against the attacks of his personal opponents.

The Epistles to the Colossians and to the Ephesians bear a decidedly *christological* impress; the former brings out chiefly the ante-mundane (preëxistent) and exclusive mediatorship and glory of Christ, in opposition to the Colossian errorists; the latter establishes mainly His subsequent exaltation over all things, in opposition to dogmatic perversions and dissensions.

The Epistle to the Philippians has a *christological-pastoral* and prominently *ethical* charac

ter, in so far as the Apostle makes the favorite congregation of Philippi his special co-worker in his apostolic office; and in order to make that congregation *ethically complete*, he holds up for its imitation the life of Christ.

The Epistle to Philemon is decidedly *pastoral*, with special reference to the *care of souls*.

Of the three *Pastoral* Epistles, properly so called, the First to Timothy, as well as that to Titus, were above all designed as the apostolic regulation for *pastoral church government;* and the Second Epistle to Timothy was prominently designed as the apostolic rule for the *pastoral conduct and call.*

OBSERVATIONS.—1. The specific fundamental thoughts that control every one of the Pauline Epistles (as of the Biblical works in general), are still very much neglected, to the injury of a truly organic, anatomical, synthetical and analytical exegesis. These writings are often not only treated as dead objects, but they are dissected in every direction, as if they were destitute of all organic structure.

2. Dr. BAUR is not only frequently surprised when he finds a new Pauline Epistle containing something new, but he makes this point a means of suspicion.

C. *Their Genuineness.*

On the verifications of the Pauline Epistles by the testimony of Church history, compare the passage in the New Testament, 2 Peter iii. 15, and the testimonies of the Fathers, as KIRCHHOFER has collected them in his *Quellensammlung* for the history of the New Testament Canon, down to Jerome (Zürich, 1842), and as they have been treated in the introductory works of CREDNER, REUSS, GUERICKE, and others, as well as in the respective commentaries. On the apocryphal literature connected with the name of Paul, see WINER, ii. p. 222.

Among these pseudo-Pauline works, deserve especial mention the spurious correspondence between Paul and Seneca the philosopher, which is contained in the apocryphal collection of FABRICIUS, ii. p. 880 ff.; and an imaginary *third* Epistle of the Apostle to the Corinthians, composed as a substitute for one which was imagined to be lost (see my *Apost. Zeitalter*, i. p. 205), together with a spurious epistle of the Corinthians to Paul, which therefore proceeded from a misunderstanding (see DE WETTE, *Einl.*, p. 271). The false conjecture of a special Epistle to the Laodiceans, on the ground of a misunderstanding of Col. iv. 16 (where we are to understand rather the Epistle to the Ephesians as intended also for Laodicea, the last of the Ephesian cycle of congregations), has given rise to a fictitious Epistle to the Laodiceans (see my *Apost. Zeitalter*, ii. p. 211). Certain critics have missed also another Epistle to the Philippians (DE WETTE, p. 271). Compare the article in HERZOG'S *Real-Encyclopædie*, *Pseudepigraphen des Neuen Testaments*. The false Acts, which have been attributed to Paul, are: *Acta Petri et Pauli; Acta Pauli et Theclæ*. The Ebionites, moreover, have caricatured the portrait of the Apostle Paul in the most shameful manner, and stamped him with the likeness of a heresiarch (see NEANDER, *Kirchengesch.*, 3d ed., i. 198).

APPENDIX.—The criticism of the school of BAUR proceeds really on two pre-suppositions, with which the founder has alienated himself from the Christian standpoint, and surrendered himself fully to a pantheistic philosophy. BAUR has evidently designed to compensate for his want of respect for the matter and spirit of revelation, by a superstitious yielding to the masters of science; and his success was facilitated by the fact that his great learning and subtle acuteness, or his mere scholarly attainments, have served to hide his far greater incapacity of judgment concerning the phenomena of actual life; and that gravity of his inquiry and method has blinded the readers to his frivolous undervaluing of the religious and even of the moral spirit of the Biblical writings. His superstitious veneration for the mere method and forms of science was already apparent in his *Symbolik und Mythologie*, which he wrote while yet a follower of SCHLEIERMACHER, in the years 1824–'25. To whom else than to him could it ever have occurred to divide such a historical work after the scheme of SCHLEIERMACHER'S *Dogmatics*, and to describe, first, "the pure and universal feeling of independence," and then "the antithesis of sin and grace which enter into the religious consciousness?" Such a disciple of SCHLEIERMACHER, after he had become a follower of HEGEL, must, with the same slavish superstition for science, and with the same want of perception of the peculiarity of the object pervert, by his Ebionitic hypothesis, the evangelical and apostolic

history, according to the Hegelian misconception of the development of life and history. Under such circumstances there could, of course, be no proper discrimination of the different conceptions of imperfection and perfection, nor any true appreciation of original and new historical principles and factors. But his yielding was only a partial one, so long as he was not fully immersed in the pantheistic view of Hegel; or rather, it appeared only partial so long as he did not, with STRAUSS and his school, apply this view to the evangelical history and its witnesses, in order to judge them upon the principle that miracles are impossible. In the end, his superstition, which he had transferred from SCHLEIERMACHER to HEGEL, led him to the belief that his own science and school were infallible.

Such a spirit of scholastic superstition, which gradually arose to fanaticism, was naturally connected with a great want of practical common sense, and an incapacity of judgment concerning the real facts of life. We pass by the first indication of the same, the entire absence of faith; for "faith is not given to every man." We do not speak, therefore, of a defect of religious, but of scientific and moral judgment.

As far as the scientific appreciation of objective facts is concerned, we ask once more: How can a scholar write a history of *mythology* and *religion* according to the classification of SCHLEIERMACHER'S *Dogmatics?* Further, how can a scholar, endowed with sound judgment, write a history of the *Christian Gnosis*, and make an unheard-of leap from the old Gnostics clear over the whole Middle Ages (Scholastics and Mystics), down to Jacob Bœhm, with a very superficial touch on Manichæism and on Augustine? How can one write a history of the *doctrine of the atonement*, which should have its point of departure in the Gnostic dualism, and its aim in the Hegelian system? If this can be accomplished, then truly can the *history of the doctrine of the Trinity*, as well as of the *incarnation* of God, be made to run out into the desert of Hegelian pantheism. If this be possible, then can one easily interpret historical deeds allegorically (the Epistle to Philemon, for example), and, on the other hand, explain literally what is really an allegorical composition (the Apocalypse).

The worst of all inadequacies are moral ones. It betrays a very perverted taste, when one can regard the Gnostics as a central force of development in the conflict between the Pauline and Johannean theology; and likewise, when one so far misconceives the old distinction between apocryphal and canonical writings as to think that a religious romance of later date, falsely called the Clementine Homilies, is made a proper standard for the adjudication of the Biblical writings. But it is worst of all to attribute to the Biblical books studied and intentional tendencies of human parties, and even crafty fabrications. In this respect, BAUR and his school have far transcended even STRAUSS. This is a psychological phenomenon, which can only be saved from the charge of immorality by the largest stretch of charity, and the assumption of an excessive scholastic fanaticism in the treatment of difficult critical problems.

On these premises the value and probable fate of BAUR'S criticism of the New Testament writings, which has spread like an avalanche in Eastern Switzerland, France, and Holland, is easily determined. This false system has arisen from a diseased, superstitious worship of modern philosophy and criticism, and developed into maturity. But it is doomed to utter destruction, since it has no root in the objective facts of revelation and of the kingdom of God, but is chiefly grounded in the pantheistic and abstract idealistic conceptions of modern culture. We do not say, in the sound culture itself. The only plausible occasion and excuse of this false system is the fact that the ideality and the universality of the historical Christ, together with His roots and ramifications throughout the whole human race, have not always been sufficiently appreciated in the orthodox theology of the Church. The beginning of a better appreciation does not certainly belong to the school of BAUR, but only the heretical perversion and defacement of the same.*

§ 4. THE CHARACTER OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES.—HERMENEUTIC HINTS.

According to THOLUCK (*Epistle to the Romans*, p. 22), *strength*, *fulness*, and *fire* are the spiritual characteristics of the Apostle, and they are reflected in his style. He adduces two statements from the early Church concerning the Apostle's manner of speech. The first

* [This appendix is condensed in the translation, with unessential omissions. In the preface to the second edition, and in self-defence against SCHENKEL, DR. LANGE supports this severe judgment by a number of quotations from BAUR'S work on *Paul*, which it is unnecessary to insert here. BAUR and the *Tübingen School* are not likely ever to acquire the importance which they enjoyed in Germany for a brief period. This school is simply a modern phase of Gnosticism (ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις, 1 Tim. vi. 20), and, like the Gnosticism of the second century, it has been overruled for a good purpose, in stirring up the Church to a deeper investigation and defence of the primitive records of Christianity, which have already come out triumphant, with new gains of knowledge, of this as of every other trial. I say this with all due respect for the genius and learning of BAUR, and the value of his masterly historical criticism, where it does not touch matters of faith which he did not understand (1 Cor. ii. 9–16).—P. S.]

is by St. Jerome, *Epist.* 48 *ad Pammachium*,* c. 18: "*Paulum proferam, quem quotiescumque lego, videor mihi non verba audire sed tonitrua. Videntur quidem verba simplicia, et quasi innocentis hominis ac rusticani, et qui nec facere nec declinare noverit insidias, sed quocunque respexeris, fulmina sunt. Hæret in causa; capit omne, quod tetigerit; tergum vertit, ut superet; fugam simulat, ut occidat.* The second statement, from Chrysostom, *De Sacerdotio*, i. 4, 7, compares the Apostle to an iron wall, which surrounds, with his Epistles, the churches of the whole world; and to a noble military chieftain, who leads captive all modes of thought, and brings them into subjection to faith, etc. Tholuck adds, that Paul is lauded as a master of eloquence in a fragment of the heathen critic Longinus, though critics have declared the passage doubtful (see Hug, *Einl. in's N. T.*, ii. p. 334).

Tholuck then proceeds to say: "With these oratorical gifts there are connected also defects; namely, an excessive conciseness and pregnancy of expression, and carelessness in the formation of sentences, which produce those numerous anacolutha (?). This leads us to the hermeneutical question, which has an important doctrinal bearing, whether these peculiarities of form are at all detrimental to the clearness and definiteness of the thought. In this respect, no commentator has uttered more severe complaints against the Apostle than Rückert (comp. his *Christliche Philosophie*, ii. p. 401, and the introduction to the first edition of his Commentary on the Romans)."† Tholuck very justly remarks against Rückert, that defects of style do not necessarily arise from obscurity of thought on the part of the author, "least of all with *intuitive*, and at the same time fervid characters. The thinking of Paul is intuitive, but coupled with acute penetration, which was refined and sharpened by rabbinical culture almost to the excess of subtlety; therefore, when there is a want of logical clearness in his writings, we must seek the cause partly in the overflow of his abundant ideas, and partly in the impatience of his vivacity." We must distinguish, he says, difficulty from obscurity. But when Tholuck advances the opinion, that no writer of later times stands so near the Apostle in excellencies and defects as Hamann, we must hesitate to accept the conjunction. Paul's obscurity proceeds from a fulness of vital energy, and is really only the result of a quick movement, of a clear profundity, and of a perfect originality; and must certainly be distinguished from the obscurity of a one-sided scholastic taste and defective and perverted style. Tholuck maintains the perfection of the Pauline thought, while he acknowledges an imperfection of expression.

Against this view, R. Rothe, of Heidelberg [died 1867], has raised his voice in his acute essay, *New attempt to elucidate the Pauline passage*, Rom. v. 12–21. "According to Rothe, the apparent irregularity of Paul's style arises solely from the depth and acuteness of his thoughts, from the carefully-wrought elaboration of his purpose, and from that preciseness of expression which, the more studied it is, the more easily it approaches abruptness." Tholuck cites a similar expression of Baur (p. 24), but endorses, on the contrary, the view of Calvin: *Quin potius singulari Dei providentia factum est, ut sub contemptibili verborum humilitate altissima hæc mysteria nobis traderentur, ut non humanæ eloquentiæ potentia, sed sola spiritus efficacia niteretur nostra fides.* In favor of this interpretation, Tholuck makes use of the Apostle's own declaration, 1 Cor. ii. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 6. The second passage does not belong here at all, and the first has an ironical sound, and does not prove what Tholuck designs to establish by it.

In the treatment of this question the following points must be especially taken into consideration:

1. The New Testament idiom generally is now no longer regarded merely as the lowly

* [The original *Psammachiam*, even in the second edition, is evidently a double error of the printer; the one is borrowed from Tholuck, *l. c.* Pammachius was a Roman senator and friend of Jerome.—P. S.]

† [In this presumptuous disposition to criticise St. Paul, Rückert has found an English imitator in Professor Jowett, who thinks it necessary to qualify what he considers to be a blind and undiscriminating admiration of the apostle, and who misrepresents him as a confused, though profound thinker, who uttered himself "in broken words and hesitating forms of speech, with no beauty or comeliness of style." But such paradoxical views are quite isolated, especially in England and America, and are not likely to unsettle the established estimate which Christendom, Greek, Latin, and Evangelical, has set upon the great apostle of the Gentiles for these eighteen hundred years.—P. S.]

"form of a servant" (Phil. ii. 7), compared with the classic language; hence there is no more reason why the Pauline expression and style should be regarded in this light when compared with the classic method of composition; provided we do not apply here the standard of the taste and judgment of the world. The New Testament idiom in general is a pneumatic development or transformation of the Grecian language. The apostolic expression has thus the prerogative of its special peculiarity, conditioned by its new spiritual life. This peculiarity may be regarded in the main as the free commingling of Hebrew directness and Hellenic accommodation; or, in other words, as the primitive Christian style, whose characteristics are the highest simplicity and vivacity in conjunction with the highest penetration and consecration of soul.

2. Down to the present time the comprehension of the Biblical books has been essentially retarded by regarding them too little as original creations, and by inquiring too little into their fundamental thoughts. Several critics have applied to them the conception of ordinary book-making and book-writing, and even of book-patching—a conception which is utterly antagonistic to all understanding of the historical books of the Old Testament and of the New Testament Gospels, and which also prevents a proper comprehension of Biblical inspiration. We should conclude thus: The fundamental thought of the book is inspired by the Spirit of revelation, according to the measure of the degree of revelation in the Old Testament, and of the link of revelation in the New Testament; but all the single portions of the book are immediately inspired—that is, animated and controlled by its fundamental thought; therefore, also mediately inspired by the Spirit of revelation. But among the prevailing conceptions, the Rabbinical, lifeless, atomistic, scholastic view of the book, is reflected in the picture of the book. The dead conception casts its dark, spiritless shade upon the living object. So long, therefore, as we do not here apply the conception of single spiritual organisms, we cannot distinguish the whole from the parts, nor the parts from the whole. Most of our definitions, divisions, and anatomical dissections of Biblical books furnish the proof that our theology has not yet reached the scientific standpoint which CUVIER attained in natural science (palæontology); for he knew how to construct the whole figure of the animal from a single fossil bone. In support of this opinion, we need only to recall the opinions of SCHLEIERMACHER on the Epistle of James, DE WETTE's view of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and BAUR's representation of the Epistle to the Romans, which he made to lie comprehended in chapters ix., x., and xi. RÜCKERT likewise professes to find in the Epistle to the Romans, and in other books, certain obscurities and confused statements—in which charges FRITZSCHE justly recognizes the obscurities of the critic himself. The acceptance of numerous digressions on the part of Paul is well known; and even THOLUCK does not regard the Epistle to the Romans quite free from them.

As far as the organic unity of the Pauline Epistles is concerned, we would make the following statements as a guide:

(*a.*) Every Pauline Epistle has a clearly-defined fundamental idea which controls the entire contents of the Epistle.

(*b.*) This fundamental thought shapes not only the division, but also the introduction and conclusion, and even pervades all the slender threads.

(*c.*) The introduction is determined by the Apostle's method, which seizes the appropriate point of connection with a congregation or a person, in order to develop the argument into its full proportions.

(*d.*) The introduction is followed throughout by a fundamental or didactic theme (proposition), which the Apostle proceeds dogmatically to elaborate.

(*e.*) This elaboration arrives at a final theme, from which the practical inferences are carefully drawn.

(*f.*) The conclusion corresponds so exactly to the fundamental thought of the Epistle, that it is reflected in all the single parts.

We shall illustrate these principles by presenting our analysis of the Epistle to the

Romans. But we must first be allowed to make some observations on the remaining Pauline Epistles.*

The fundamental theme of the FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS is a determination of the proper condition of a Christian congregation, as made one by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, in opposition to the character and shades of partisanship; chap. i. 9–12. The final theme is, accordingly, a recommendation of stability and of a sound growth in conscious hope; chap. xv. 58. In the first part of the execution Paul shows that he, with his fundamental preaching, would yet not have the church become Pauline in any sectarian or partisan sense; chap. i. 13–iv. 20. He furnishes at the same time, in an apologetic form, a polemical argument against the partisan attachment to Apollo. The second part opposes the different forms of antinomianism that arose mainly from a misconception of the Pauline doctrine of freedom, chap. v. 1–xi. 1. (Disorderly marriages. Heathen tribunals. Whoredom. Mixed marriages. Meals made of idolatrous offerings. True and false freedom. Meat offered to idols.) In the third part those errors are discussed which prevailed chiefly among the Petrine Judaizing Christians, chap. xi. 2–chap. xiv. (The dress of the synagogue in the congregation. Separatism at the communion. Jewish self-boasting, especially with regard to the gift of tongues.) The fourth part teaches the real resurrection in opposition to the spiritualism of the "Christ-Party" (οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Cor. i. 12), chap. xv. 1–57. The final theme is a demand that the sentiment of unity become practical: a. In the collections for the Jewish Christians in Palestine. b. In the active sympathy with Paul's labors among the Gentile Christians. c. In the proper recognition of the friends of Paul, Timothy, Apollos, Stephanas, etc. The point of connection in the introduction is the rich charismata or spiritual gifts of the congregation, placed in the light of grace, and of their necessary preservation until the coming of Christ. In the conclusion we find, together with abundant greetings of brotherly communion, an admonition to salute one another with a holy kiss, and an anathema pronounced against declension from the love of Christ; which, without doubt, applies to separatism or sectarianism, especially that of a spiritualistic character.

Having set forth, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the true unity of a Christian congregation endowed with the gracious gifts of the Spirit, he portrays, in the SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS, in form of self-defence, the proper official functions in relation to a congregation. The fundamental theme, chap. i. 6, 7. The unity of the Apostle with the congregation in all his official sufferings and joys with reference to the visit which he designed to make to them. The final theme is a demand that the congregation should be so built up by the Apostle's word, that his visit to them might be a source of joy and not of sorrow, chap. xii. 19–21. 1. The Apostle's official sufferings, chap i. 8–chap. ii. 13. (His sufferings in Ephesus, and their prayers for him. His distress at being prevented from visiting the Corinthians forthwith to do them good. His affliction at the previous letter, an evidence of his love. Removal of the sorrow by the restoration of the penitent. His care for them.) 2. The Apostle's official joys, chap. ii. 14–chap. iv. 6. (His triumphs in Christ. His epistle of commendation, the Corinthian Church. The splendor of the New Testament office, and its glorious strength which supports the official incumbents themselves. The enjoyment which his office afforded.) 3. Official sufferings and joys in close conjunction, chap. iv. 7–chap. vii. 16. (The life of the apostles in its contrasts. Their death the life of the Church. Their pilgrimage below, their home with the Lord. Their zeal in the love of Christ. Their condition in the new life. Their message of reconciliation. The conduct of the Apostle in his service of God should bless the Church by awakening and encouraging it to holiness. Certainly this should be the case, after the cheering report that the Apostle had received from Titus of the effect of his First Epistle.) 4. The common sufferings and joys of the office and the congregation, and their effect in creating sympathy and benevolence, chap. viii. 1–chap. x. 1. (The example of the Church in Macedonia. Official tenderness and prudence in suggesting and encouraging a collection, and in the institution of the diaconate. Encouragement and

* The harmonious fundamental thoughts of the Epistles everywhere result from a combination of the fundamental and final themes in connection with the introduction and conclusion.

promises.) 5. The defence of the office in opposition to the charges made against it which threatened to sunder the office and the congregation, chap. x. 2–chap. xii. 18. (Prudence is the official or self-defence of the Apostle. The epistolary form is the expression of forbearance, but not of cowardice or inequality in conduct. Enforced expression of self-respect in contradistinction from vain self-praise. The liability of congregations to be misled by false apostles. The unselfishness of the Apostle in contrast with their selfishness. The painful self-defence that was wrung from him. His works and his weakness. His contemplation and ecstacies, and the thorn in his flesh. His signs and wonders in the midst of them. His self-denial and readiness to be offered for the Church. Also in the sending of Titus.)—The final theme, chap. xii. 19, 20. The execution: a demand of the congregation that they be so equipped as not to need the painful exercise of his official discipline, chap. xiii. 1–10. The introduction: the point of connection. Praise to God for a common comfort in a common sorrow. The conclusion: a reminder to reciprocal consolation in harmonious action.

The fundamental theme of the Epistle to the GALATIANS is the solemn establishment of the Pauline gospel for the Galatian Church, in view of its departure from the same, by a conditional anathema pronounced against those who preach a heterogeneous gospel, chap. i. 6–9. The admonition made in the final theme corresponds to this—chap. v. 1—to stand fast in the liberty, and not to be entangled again in the yoke of legal justification. Development of the fundamental theme. The Apostle proves the worth of his gospel: 1. By his divine apostolic call and independence, chap. i. 10–24. 2. By the recognition of the congregation at Jerusalem, and of the "pillar" apostles, chap. ii. 1–10. 3. By the yielding of Peter to his evangelical principle, chap. ii. 11–21. 4. By the personal experience of the Galatians, chap. iii. 1–5. 5. By the character of the Old Testament itself, namely, by the relation between Abraham with the promise, and Moses with the law, chap. iii. 6–24. 6. By the proof that the law, as a schoolmaster, has been abrogated by the coming of Christ, chap. iii. 25–chap. iv. 7. Paul then makes an application of these arguments: 1. To the aberration of the Galatians, chap. iv. 8–16. 2. To the false teachers, vers. 17, 18. 3. To himself, and his disturbed relation to them, vers. 19, 20. 4. His address to the sticklers for the law, and his conviction of them by the law, chap. iv. 21–27. 5. His address to the brethren in the faith. Reference to the contradiction between the bond and the free, vers. 28–31.—Development of the final theme: Stand fast in the liberty of Christ. *a.* The consequences of legal circumcision maintained as a doctrinal principle, chap. v. 2–13. *b.* Warning of a misconception and abuse of freedom. The law, in its truth, is transformed into the law of love and of the Spirit, chap. v. 14–24. *c.* The evidence of the life in the Spirit as the law of freedom, in the practice of the virtues of love, humility, meekness, etc., for the restoration of true conduct by all. The antagonism between sowing to the flesh and sowing to the Spirit, chap. v. 25–chap. vi. 11. The conclusion, vers. 11–18: A reminder of his grief which expressed itself also in a repeated warning, preaching of the cross, and a conditional invocation of blessing. Reference to the last word, ver. 17. Appeal to their spirit, ver. 18. There is no need of showing how perfectly the short exordium—where the point of connection significantly disappears or is clothed in the expression of surprise, ver. 6—corresponds to the whole epistle.

The Epistles to the EPHESIANS and COLOSSIANS represent the absolute unity in Christ, to which all the faithful, and with them all humanity and the world, are called. Their difference, however, consists in this: the Epistle to the Colossians derives this unity from the fact that Christ is the principle, the ἀρχή, of all life, as well of creation as of resurrection; and this is done in opposition to the Colossian errorists who, *with* Christ, would also honor the angels as vital agents and mediators, and who constructed a dualistic antagonism between spirit and matter. The Epistle to the Ephesians, on the other hand, represents Christ as the τέλος, the glorified head, in whom all things are comprehended after the eternal purpose of God. Accordingly, these Epistles, though possessing great external resemblance, yet stand in an internal harmonious contrast, as the Alpha and Omega in Christ, which is highly

adapted to explain the relation of the elementary points of agreement and disagreement among the synoptical evangelists.

The Epistle to the COLOSSIANS institutes as its fundamental theme, the truth: Christ, as the image of God, is the ἀρχή, the πρωτότοκος, the author both of the first creation and of the second—the resurrection, chap. i. 15–18. To this the final theme corresponds: Having risen with Christ, look forward toward the heavenly riches in the glorified Christ, chap. iii. 1, 2. Development of the fundamental theme: In Christ there is all fulness. Absolute reconciliation, even of the heathen, for the evangelization of whom the Apostle suffers and labors, being deeply concerned that they might become one in Christ. Consequently, he warns them against false teachers who make divisions between Christ and the angels, Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians, spirit and body, and who, by a false spirituality, fall into carnal lusts, chap. i. 19–chap. ii. 23. The final theme: Looking for the unity with the heavenly Christ in expectation of the revelation of his future glory. Inferences: Laying aside of fleshly lust. Unity in the life of the new man. The virtues of the life in Christ. Sanctification of the domestic life, of a home to the unity in Christ. Communion of prayer, also with the Apostle and his work. The proper course toward the world in accordance with this prayer, chap. iii. 1–chap. iv. 6. Conclusion: Sending of Tychicus. Recommendation of Onesimus. Greetings. Occasion of community of life with the Ephesian circle, vers. 7–18. The conclusion as well as the introduction is also here in full accordance with the fundamental thought. The connecting point of the introduction lies in chap i. 4, 5, together with the praise of Epaphras and the invocation of blessing, as well as the common thanksgiving for the redemption which has established a new standpoint.

The fundamental theme of the Epistle to the EPHESIANS represents the risen and glorified Christ as the object eternally appointed, and openly declared such by the calling of the faithful, and as the head of the congregation for the comprehension and unity of all things, chap. i. 20–23 (a truth designed to console and cheer the Church of Asia Minor). To this the final theme corresponds, chap. iv. 1–6. The unifying power of Christ declared in the fundamental theme has shown itself: (*a.*) In the heathen becoming with the Jews one household of God. (*b.*) It exhibits itself in the joy with which Paul, in conformity with the manifestation of the eternal mystery of their election, invites them to the gospel salvation and suffers for them. It should, therefore, manifest itself also in the joy and hope of the Ephesians. Accordingly, the Ephesians, chap. iv. 1–6, should preserve the unity of the Spirit. (*a.*) The gracious gifts of the individual, as an assigned endowment, is a bond of unity and not a ground of separation, vers. 7–10. (*b.*) The official organism is appointed to train up all to the perfect manhood of the body of Christ, vers. 11–16. (*c.*) This unity requires the separation from the heathen sinful lusts by the renewal of the life, chap. iv. 17–chap. v. 14. (1. Proper conduct toward every man, truth, meekness, justice, chastity of speech, spirituality, freedom from passion, kindness and philanthropy, love. 2. Avoiding of heathen vices.) (*d.*) It demands prudence, redemption of the time, caution, and a zeal which does not come from exciting stimulants, but by spiritual songs and thanksgiving, chap. v. 15–20. (*e.*) It demands reciprocal submission and a sacred harmony of domestic life, chap. v. 21–chap. vi. 9. (*f.*) It demands watchfulness, energy, equipment, self-defence, and war against the kingdom of Satan, chap. vi. 10–17. On the other hand, the advancement of the kingdom of God in all saints and in the work of the Apostle by prayer and intercession, vers. 18–20. The conclusion characterizes this sermon on Christian unity as a message for solace and encouragement by Tychicus, in connection with the sufferings of the Apostle. And in the same sense must we understand the magnificent doxology of the introduction, with its invocation of blessings.

In the Epistle to the PHILIPPIANS the difference between the didactic and parenetic word appears but slightly, since the entire Epistle is pervaded by the feeling of the personal community of the Apostle with the Church at Philippi. Nevertheless, even here it may be observed. In the words, chap. i. 8–11, he speaks of his heart's desire that his dear Church should become perfect in every respect unto the day of Christ; that it might abound more and more, be purified, and be filled unto the glory of God. To this the final theme corre

sponds, chap. iv. 1. The call: that they might continue to be his joy and crown in the Lord. The fundamental thought, the principal theme, discloses itself first in the communication of his experience at Rome, and of his state of mind in consequence thereof, because he designed that the Philippians, by virtue of their wider unity with him, should avail themselves of it in their own experience, chap. i. 12–30. Then he exhorts them to improve their unity by means of the humility of every individual, in imitation of the example of the humble self-humiliation of Christ—a passage which gives this Epistle a specifically christological character, though it is viewed in its ethical aspect and bearing, chap. ii. 1–11. Next to humility, the Church should increase its inner spiritual tension and efforts, vers. 12–16, stimulate the members to rejoice with him,—for which purpose he will also send Timothy to them, as he sends Epaphroditus, chap. ii. 17–chap. iii. 1. But then, too, the experience which he had made in Rome concerning the opposition of the Judaizers (chap. i. 15) causes him to warn them decidedly,—after the intimation of chap. i. 28,—against their plots, with reference to his own relation to them, chap. iii. 2–6. Then follows the declaration how far he had left the legalism of these opponents behind in his knowledge of Christ, his faith in justification by free grace, and his struggle after perfection, unto the resurrection of the dead and the life in heaven; in which respect they, too, should be his companions against the enemies of the cross of Christ, chap. iii. 7–21. The explication of the final word indicates pointedly to that which the Apostle had occasion to censure. A disagreement between Evodias and Syntyche must be removed; elements of oppression, bitterness, anxiety, and division must disappear; the members must be like the Apostle in continual striving after what is good, chap. iv. 2–9. With this reminder the Apostle also connects a high recognition of the Church's Christian life of love, which it had shown, now as before, by contributing to his support—a privilege which he, in his keen sense of independence, granted to no other congregation, vers. 10–20. The conclusion corresponds, with his invocation of blessing (ver. 19), to the *fundamental thought*, and with his greeting, to the *key-note*, of the Epistle. The connecting point is found in ver. 6.

THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS.—The First Epistle is pervaded by the fundamental thought: *The Lord will come speedily*; the Second, by the thought: *The Lord will not yet come speedily.* Both of these are in accordance with the truth; because, in the first part, the question is concerning the coming of the Lord in his dynamic rule in a religious sense; and in the second part, concerning the coming of the Lord in a definite historical and chronological sense.

The theoretical theme of the FIRST EPISTLE is contained in the words, chap. i. 9, 10 (comp. chap. ii. 12, 16, 19, etc.). Accordingly, the whole of Christianity, particularly that of the Thessalonians, is eschatological: *a waiting for the coming of the Son of God from heaven, as the Saviour from future wrath.* (*a.*) The labors of Paul among them have corresponded to this waiting, and their conduct amid the persecutions of the times should also correspond to it, chap. ii. 1–16. (*b.*) The Apostle has been careful of the condition and steadfastness of the Church, as he was so soon separated from it. His propositions to visit them again. The sending of Timothy. He has been encouraged by the account of Timothy, chap. ii. 17–chap. iii. 13. (*c.*) Admonition of the true course of conduct in that expectation (the true "saints of the last day"). No polygamy, or lust of the flesh; no separation; no excited wandering about, instead of quiet labor, chap. iv. 1–12. (*d.*) Instruction concerning the relation of those who are asleep to the coming of the Lord, chap. iv. 13–18. (*e.*) The question after the times and seasons. Answer: As a thief in the night, chap. v. 1–3. The practical theme: *Watch*, chap. v. 4. Development: According to your spiritual nature; your daily life; your calling; your relation to Christ. Inferences: chap. v. 5–22. Conclusion: The invocation of blessing in harmony with the fundamental thoughts, ver. 23. Connecting point of the introduction. The Thessalonians are successors of the apostles and of the Lord by the joy of their faith, according to their hope amid many tribulations, chap. i. 3–6.

In the SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS the fundamental thought appears: that the judgment of the Lord upon the world will first be matured—in consequence of the persecution of the Christians; and the worthiness of the faithful must be assured before the

Lord will come for the execution of the final judgment and for the redemption of his children, chap. i. 5–8. (*a.*) Fuller declaration as to how the maturing of the judgment is connected with the maturing of the faithful, chap. i. 9–12. (*b.*) Warning against chiliastic delusions, as if the day of the Lord were at hand in a chronological sense, chap. ii. 1, 2. (*c.*) How the whole development of unbelief and apostasy must precede the appearance of Antichrist (comp. Matt. xxiv. 24; the Revelation), chap. ii. 3–14. The final word, chap. ii. 15: Steadfastness, according to his instructions. Inferences: Prayer for the mission of the gospel; love and patience, discipline, industry, beneficence, and stability. The handwriting of Paul himself as a warning against chiliastic delusions. The connecting point of the introduction: The endurance of the Thessalonians in their faith, in the midst of the persecutions, chap. i. 4.

The Pastoral Epistles constitute so far a parallel to the Epistles to the Corinthians, as that the First Epistle to Timothy, and the Epistle to Titus, teach, according to the analogy of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, how the congregation should be officially watched, directed, and further developed. In the Second Epistle to Timothy, on the contrary, Paul, in anticipation of his martyrdom, instructs his pupil to become, in his official work, his spiritual successor, and thus to reproduce the life-picture of the apostolic office which is portrayed in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

The theme of the First Epistle to Timothy is the renewed scriptural transmission of the Divine commission which the Apostle received when he was called to establish the real life of faith and of the Church, to Timothy, his substitute in Ephesus for that special sphere, chap. i. 18. *According to the measure of this commission* he expresses a wish in the greeting that he might possess a rich measure of grace, chap. i. 1, 2. Accordingly, he should remain in Ephesus and watch over and protect the pure doctrine against Judaistic errors and the germs of Gnosticism. The object of the preservation of orthodoxy was the edification of the Church in piety and pure love. The pure doctrine should maintain a pure heart, a pure conscience, and a pure faith, ver. 5. The immediate occasion was chiefly the Judaizing Christian zealots for the law. Therefore the Apostle characterizes his relation to the law. If he lays great stress on the fact that he, too, had once been a blasphemer and a persecutor, he at the same time gives his true estimate of that zeal for the latter, and declares how he has been led beyond it, by the mercy of God, to become an example of faith, whose defence he now gives over by letter to Timothy. This official call is a call (*a.*) to conflict, because the apostates oppose the faithful, vers. 18, 20. (*b.*) To the demand for universal love and intercession for all sorts and conditions of men (*in opposition to Jewish particularism*), chap. ii. 1–7. (*c.*) To the furtherance of universal custom, according to which the women should not dare to announce themselves as (Judaizing) prophetesses, vers. 8–15. (*d.*) To the promotion of the true organization of the congregation. 1. The bishop, or, which is the same thing, the presbyter and his house. 2. The deacon and the deaconess. 3. The management of the house of God in general, according to its divine nature, chap. iii. (*e.*) For the settlement and fighting of the germs of error which might ripen in the future. Gnostic errors and principles, chap. iv. 1–11. (*f.*) For the self-guidance of the ecclesiastical officer, chap. iv. 12–16. (*g.*) For the proper conduct toward every one, especially according to the distinction of old and young with reference to the service of the congregation (the men, women, and widows). Special direction on the treatment of the widows in general, especially on the employment of the old widows for the good of the congregation. Special direction on the proper treatment and distinction of the elders, as well as on the proper prudence at the appointment and ordination for offices. Care over his own deportment and health (chap. v. 24, 25, is said with reference to the trial, ver. 22). Care of the servants in the Church, chap. v. 1–vi. 2. The final statement, chap. iv. 3–5. Inferences: Doctrinal disputes, and their worldly motive, vers. 5–10. Renewed inculcation of the command (commission), vers. 12 16. Concluding word, vers. 17–21.

The Epistle to Titus. The commission which the Apostle gave to Titus for Crete, is differently expressed from that given to Timothy for Ephesus. His chief task was the appointment of presbyters in the single congregations, together with a further development

of the Church at Crete, chap. i. 5. Accordingly, the Apostle describes first of all the requisites of elders, with reference, no doubt, to the new experiences at Crete, and also the intrusion of Judaizing seducers, chap. i. 6–16. Then the proper care of the congregation, and pastoral work of Titus, with reference to special relations, ages, and classes of society, chap. ii. 1–15. Finally, the guidance of Christian Cretans into proper conduct, especially in regard to the avoiding of a disturbing, quarrelsome, and passionate spirit with reference to the goodness of God in Christ, chap. iii. 1–7. The Apostle confirms this direction by his final theme, chap. iii. 8. It is in accordance with his statement of the requisites of the presbyters, chap. i. 9, 10, that he forbids him from meddling with the scholastic controversies of the errorists, especially the legalists; and admonishes him first to deal practically with sectarian men, and then to avoid them, vers. 9–11. The concluding word: The sending of Tychicus, special appointments, and greetings. The introduction is an expression of the Apostle's authority, and of the authorization of Titus.

The Second Epistle to Timothy was designed, as has been already said, to conduct Timothy further into his official life, so that he, as the favorite spiritual son of the Apostle, might enter into the footsteps of the latter after his departure from this world. This is expressed by the fundamental thought, chap. i. 6–8. The Apostle strengthens this fundamental thought, first, (*a.*) By God's call to be saved, vers. 9, 10. (*b.*) By his own call to be the Apostle to the Gentiles, vers. 11, 12. (*c.*) By Timothy's relation as a scholar to him, vers. 13, 14. (*d.*) By reference to the unfaithful and the true, vers. 15–18. He then develops the fundamental thoughts. (*a.*) He must be strengthened by faithful co-workers, chap. ii. 1, 2. (*b.*) His readiness to suffer, and his endurance, after the example of Paul in imitation of Christ, vers. 3–13. (*c.*) Shunning the spirit of controversy. The injurious fruits of the same must be perceived (Hymenæus, Philetus); and oppositions and distinctions in God's house must be rightly understood. Timothy must avoid impure persons, and all lusts and fruitless scholastic controversies; he must honor, instruct, and restrain in the proper spirit, chap. ii. 14–26. The Apostle exhibits, finally, the fundamental thought by contrasting the future condition of the errorists and that of the apostolic disciple. The latter shall stand fast in the tradition of Paul—that is, in the New Testament, and in the Holy Scriptures—that is, the Old Testament, chap. iii. The final proposition, chap. iv. 1, 2, is a solemn transfer of his commission to the beloved disciple. Exposition: The future of the errorists and of the errors requires true apostolic men. Timothy must stand firm in the critical times, because his teacher is about to depart, vers. 3–9. But Timothy must soon come to him, since he is almost isolated. Account of his condition, vers. 9–18. Concluding word, invocation of blessings, supplements, and greetings. The introduction is in harmony with the Epistle; an expression of intimate relationship between the teacher and the disciple, and of reliance on the inner call of the latter. As a legacy in anticipation of early death, the Second Epistle to Timothy is related to the Second Epistle of Peter.

The single portions of the Epistle to Philemon group themselves about the recommendation that Onesimus be received again, vers. 10–12. The preceding parts are chiefly introductory to this central point; the subsequent verses are the amplification. The conclusion, like the introduction, refers to the call of Paul and the congregation at Colosse.

The directness of the Apostle, which is peculiar to him as a religious and also as a truly Hebrew genius, may be regarded as resulting from an intuitive state of mind; yet, in this respect, he stands below the festive contemplation of John, for the reason that he, being endowed with greater energy, exhibits a more fervent zeal and a more practical turn. The style of John reminds us, therefore, of the most spiritual poesy; that of Paul, on the other hand, of the most fiery eloquence. The culture of the latter conforms to this view. Already in the school of the rabbis he had learned the rabbinical, reflective form of thought—a system of dialectics which proceeds by questions, objections, and answers, and by *deductiones ad absurdum* from the history of theocracy. But by his intercourse with the Greeks he had also learned the Grecian method of reasoning, which meets us, for example, in 1 Cor. xv. His own manner of expression was, however, modified by two elements, which must be taken into

proper account, if one would get rid of the unfounded prejudice concerning the alleged burdened periods and obscure abruptness of the Apostle.

The first element is the liturgical, which arose in part from devotional reminiscences, and in part from prayerful attitudes of unusual depth, and from a lofty, adoring condition of his heart. The liturgical form frequently transcends the historical and dialectical structure of the periods, and this, too, in consequence of that continuity of devotional feeling which moves through a succession of rhythmic pauses. We may refer to Psalms cvii. and cxxxvi. as specimens.

The most important form of this character is the long sentence at the beginning of the Epistle to the Ephesians, vers. 3–14, which has often been misjudged by the Grecian standard, and caused so many glosses. We read it liturgically as follows:

> Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ:
> Who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places (things) in Christ:
> According as He hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world:
> That we should be holy and without blame before Him in love:
> Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself:
> According to the good pleasure of his will—to the praise of the glory of his grace—
> Wherein (in which grace) He hath made us accepted (called) in the Beloved:
> In whom (the Beloved) we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins:
> According to the riches of his grace (—justification—);
> Wherein (in which grace) He hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence (—the glorification on the intellectual side—);
> Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure—
> Which (good pleasure) He hath purposed in himself, in the dispensation of the fulness of times (epochs, καιροί):
> That He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which (all things) are in heaven, and which (all things) are on earth, even in Him:
> In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will:
> That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ:
> In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation:
> In whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise (—which was effective also in the Old Testament promise—):
> Which is the earnest of our inheritance (—the common inheritance of God's people—) until the redemption (full liberation) of the purchased possession (—from among the Jews and Gentiles—):
> Unto the praise of his glory!

In the exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, we shall make the observation that the difficulty in its concluding words can only be solved by viewing them as a liturgical form (already indicated in our statement of its contents); just as the difficulty in Rom. ix. 5 can only be explained by the assumption of a liturgical reminiscence.

In the place of the burdened periods, therefore, we substitute lyrical expressions which are liturgically simple, and in place of most of the supposed anacolutha, vital and vigorous brevities. As the former arose from the religious school and sentiment of the Apostle, so the latter came from his fervid vivacity and his rapid, ecstatic feeling in the midst of his daily work. In the preceding doxology we must supply a brief statement in place of an apparent want of connection (ver. 13). Such abridged sentences are especially noticeable in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, where, in vers. 28 and 29, the expressions Ἰουδαῖος and περιτομή have to be repeated. Therefore, with COCCEIUS, in Rom. v. 12, we simply take the ἐλάβομεν from ver. 11, and put it into ver. 12, in order to explain the much-discussed anacoluthon (διὰ τοῦτο ἐλάβομεν); whereby it is to be observed that Paul used the word λαμβάνειν emphatically in the sense of a personal, moral appropriation, to which the ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον in ver. 12 corresponds.

We can, in the main, only repeat here the characteristics already referred to. As far as the Apostle's method of representation is concerned, the peculiar feature of the so-called Pauline rhetoric must be found in the union of the strictest methodical progress of thought with the richest concrete expression; the union of a wonderful, intuitive depth with the most versatile dialectics, of an exalted contemplation with the most mighty practical tendency, of the

most comprehensive view with the most minute observation, of a flight of diction often lyrical and festive with the severest didactic distinctions, of the most original power of creating language (vid. the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα of the Apostle) with the most felicitous use of conventional expressions.

On the style of Paul much has been written, from St. JEROME down to C. L. BAUR'S *Rhetorica Paulina*, 1782, and later works. Comp. the literature in GUERICKE, *Isagogik*, p. 289 [p. 278 of the 3d ed., 1868.—P. S.]; REUSS, p. 64; SCHAFF, *History of the Apost. Church* § 158, p. 611 ff., and BERN. ALB. LASONDER, *Disquisitio de Linguæ Paulinæ Idiomate*. Traject ad Rhenum, 1866.

§ 5. THE PAULINE THEOLOGY.

The doctrinal system of the Pauline writings, as to its traditional or retrospective side, is connected with the system of James through that of Peter; and, as to its universal and prospective side, with the doctrinal type of John through the Epistle to the Hebrews. We must maintain at the outset, on the one hand, the essential identity of the Pauline doctrine with that of all the apostles (against the view of BAUR and the Tübingen School); and, on the other hand, the most marked peculiarity of the Pauline manner of contemplation and form of expression. We agree with NEANDER that Paul gives us a more fully developed system of theology than any other apostle; but we confine this to the form merely. For, as regards the matter of thought, John evidently represents the perfection of New Testament theology.

The peculiar character of Paulinism has been diversely construed. We find it in the idea that Christ, as the Son of God and Saviour of the world, who finished His historical work by His atoning death and glorious resurrection, is the absolutely new man, and, as such, the principle of a new spiritual creation in man (καινὴ κτίσις); that He is, retrospectively, or in His relation to the past, the principle of the election of the faithful as it began to be actualized in the creation of the world, in their appointment to salvation, and in their holy calling; and that He is, prospectively, or in His relation to the future, the principle of a new justification before God, of a new law of the soul, of a new life, of a new humanity, which, in and with Him, died because of the universal guilt of the old race, but which, being reconciled to God by the atoning death of Christ, rose with Him to a new and heavenly life.*

NOTE.—It is utterly foolish to assign to Paul, as some have done, a middle position between the recognition of the Old Testament—with the Jewish apostles—and the Gnostic Marcion. Paul, in his own way, is just as much a believer in the Old Testament as James (comp. Rom. iv., Gal. iii., and other passages). Only his special calling was the apostleship to the Gentiles, with its antithesis to Pharisæism and to the letter of the law, as well as with its principle of the perfect freedom of the gospel in Christ. Christ was, to the Apostle, the religious law—the law of the Spirit. The external law was to him, in a religious relation, only a pedagogic or educational symbol, and was ethically limited by the religious principle—Christ. For this reason he spiritualized the Old Testament word (Gal. iii. 24), the Jewish theology, and even the Jewish rabbinical dialectics, and converted them into an instrument of Christian doctrine and instruction. He did the same thing with the fundamental forms of Grecian and Roman culture (see Acts xvii.; Rom. xiii. 1 ff.)

§ 6. THE LITERATURE ON THE EPISTLES AND ON THE THEOLOGY OF PAUL.

Comprehensive lists of the literature in question are given at the close of § 2 (p. 14). The works on New Testament theology, and on the doctrines and writings of the apostles, by LUTTERBECK (*The New Testament Systems*), by NEANDER, SCHAFF, MESSNER, LECHLER, and others, belong in this place. [Among English works of this class, THOS. D. BERNARD, *The Progress of Doctrine in the N. T.* (Bampton Lectures for 1864), 2d ed. Lond., 1866, is especially deserving of notice.—P. S.] Then come the prominent writings on the Pauline system in particu-

* Comp. my *Apost. Age*, ii. p. 586, and LECHLER'S review of the different representations of the Pauline system, in his work on the *Apost. and Post-Apost. Age*, p. 18

lar, by MEYER, USTERI, HEMSEN, SCHRADER, DÄHNE, and relatively KÖSTLIN (*The System of the Gospel, and the Epistles of John, and kindred New Testament Systems*). BAUR, *The Apostle Paul* [2d edition, by ZELLER, 1867]. Also, EWALD, *The Epistles of the Apostle Paul, Translated and Explained*, Göttingen, 1857. SIMAR, *The Theology of St. Paul*, Freiburg, 1864 (Roman Catholic). Next come the works on the Acts of the Apostles, especially the Commentary by LECHLER and GEROCK [translated for the Am. ed. of this "Biblework," with additions by CHARLES F. SCHAEFFER]. The treatises on Paul and his theology, in a broad and narrow sense, are extremely numerous. We may mention SCHARLING, *De Paulo Apostolo ejusque adversariis, commentatio*, Havniæ, 1836; TISCHENDORF, *Doctrina Pauli de vi mortis Christi satisfactoria*, Lips., 1837; RÄBIGER *De Christologia Paulina contra Baurium*, Vratislav., 1846; HOLSTEN, *On the Word* σάρξ, Rostock, 1855; HEBART, *The Natural Theology of the Apostle Paul*, Nürnberg, 1860; LIPSIUS, *The Pauline Doctrine of Justification*, etc., *portrayed according to the four chief Epistles of the Apostle*, Leipzig, 1853; LAMPING, *Pauli de prædestinatione decreta*, Leuwarden, 1857; BEYSCHLAG, *On the Christology of Paul;* BLEEK, *Lectures on the Colossians*, etc. Berlin, 1865. [CONYBEARE AND HOWSON, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, Lond. and New York, 1853, etc., 2 vols. (three rival editions published in America, two of the popular abridgment in 1 vol., 1869); BUNGENER, *St. Paul, sa vie, son œuvre et ses épîtres*, Paris, 1867; H. F. L. ERNESTI, *The Ethics of the Apostle Paul*, Braunschweig, 1868 (154 pp.). —P. S.]

HOMILETIC AND ASCETIC LITERATURE ON THE EPISTLES OF PAUL.—BENGEL, *Periphrasis of the* 14 *Epp. of Paul;* SCHALCH, *Practical Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles, in Sermons*, Schaffhausen, 1839; STIER, *Discourses of the Apostles*, 2 parts, Leipzig, 1829 and 1830; THIESS, *The Journey from Jerusalem to Damascus; Gallery of Pauline Sermons*, Schleswig, 1841; COUARD, *Sermons on the Conversion of the Apostle Paul*, Berlin, 1833; BLUNT, *The Life of the Apostle Paul*, 24 Treatises, translated from the English, Meissen, 1861. Comp. also the serial sermons on the pericopes, or Scripture lessons, many of which are selected from the Epistles of Paul. Among these we may mention the collections of HARMS, L. HOFACKER, KAPF, MYNSTER, RANKE, STIER, NITZSCH, DEICHERT, etc. Finally, we must remember the Repertories by BRANDT, LISCO, SCHALLER, and others.

II. SPECIAL INTRODUCTION.—THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

§ 1. ROME, AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE.

As the light and darkness of Judaism was centralized in Jerusalem, the theocratic city of God (the holy city, the murderer of the prophets), so was heathen Rome, the humanitarian metropolis of the world, the centre of all the elements of light and darkness prevalent in the heathen world; and so did Christian Rome become the centre of all the elements of vital light, and of all the antichristian darkness in the Christian Church. Hence Rome, like Jerusalem, does not only possess a unique *historical* significance, but is a universal picture operative through all ages. Christian Rome, especially, stands forth as a shining ideal of the nations, which is turned into an idol of magical strength to those who are subject to its rule.

The old heathen Rome, as the residence and centre of the universal Roman monarchy, came, as HEGEL says, like the destroying tragical Fate upon the glory of the ancient world. But the same Rome which, as the unconscious instrument, executed the Divine judgments upon all the centres of ancient civilization, became also the spiritual heiress, the emporium and centre of all the secular culture of antiquity, and the preliminary condition and basis for the universal development of the congregation of Christ into the Catholic Church.

Rome was the end of the old heathen world, and for this reason it became the beginning, the universal home and point of departure of the new Catholic Christian world—a Janus temple on a large scale. It was Rome's appointed mission to effect the union of the Gentile and Jewish churches, the union of theocratic faith and humanitarian culture, the union of the Christian East and West, the union of the old civilized nations and the wandering barbarians; and (in historical reflection of the pedagogic Mosaism of the Old Testament (Gal. iii.) to carry on the pedagogic, legal, and symbolical office of training the nations of young Christian catechumens into a ripe age of faith.

But as the Roman genius was unable to thoroughly appropriate and reproduce the ancient culture, especially in its Grecian glory, so was it unable to comprehend Christianity in all its fundamental depth, and to give it ecclesiastical shape and form. Its calling was, to popularize the old literary treasures, as well as the treasures of Christian faith, according to the necessity of the barbarians, and to adjust them to their dawning intellect. As soon as Rome had succeeded in bringing its pupils to a point of maturity, its status of culture was surpassed, in a secular sense, by the revival of Grecian letters [in the fifteenth century], and in a spiritual sense, by the evangelical confession [in the sixteenth]. Rome, however, has never recognized its bounds, nor the limits of its endowment and mission. In the same proportion in which it has been eclipsed, it has resisted every progressive movement with the fanaticism of contracted egotism, and has thus incurred the judgment of history.

Rome appears first within the horizon of the Old Testament apocalyptic prophecies as a dismal picture of the future, in the prophet Daniel, chap. vii. 7 ff. The fourth beast of Daniel's vision—notwithstanding all modern objections—can only be the universal Roman monarchy. This is evident certainly from the fact, among others, that the third universal monarchy, the Macedonian (Daniel, chaps. vii. and viii.), is marked by the same symbolical number *four;* apart from the consideration that the portrayed antichristianity, chap. vii., is eschatological, while the antichristianity of chap. viii. 9 can only be a typical prelude—the antitheocracy of Antiochus Epiphanes. And as Rome appears first in the Bible in a prophetic light, so does it appear last in a prophetic light, in the Apocalypse (chap. xvii.). There, it destroys every thing as the instrument of judgment; here, it is destroyed as an object of judgment. The first historical connection of Israel with Rome was a friendly one, 1 Maccab. viii. and xii. In the apocryphal period, Judea was made a dependence of Rome by Pompey; and the same man laid the foundation of the Jewish colony in Rome, which, though in a

pitiable condition, yet had the high and universal mission to mediate the transition of Christianity from Jerusalem and Antioch to Rome (see Acts xxviii.).

Comp. the article *Rom* in WINER's *Real-Lexicon*, in ZELLER's *Biblischem Wörterbuch* (*Römer*, *Römerbrief*, *Rom*), and in HERZOG's *Real-Encyclopädie*. Special works on Rome have been written by PIRANESI, PLATNER, BUNSEN, GERHARD, CANINA, BECKER, FOURNIER, GREGOROVIUS, etc. Special evangelical essays: CHANTEPIE DE LA SAUSSAYE, *Trois Sermons sur Rome*, Leyder, 1855; SCHRÖDER, *Aus 14 Tagen in Rom*, Elberfeld, 1861. [ALFRED VON REUMONT, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, Berlin, 1867 sqq., 3 large vols.; a learned, able and interesting work, by one who resided many years in Rome, and had every facility for his task.—P. S.]

§ 2. THE ROMAN CONGREGATION.

The first beginnings of the congregation of Roman Christians cannot be historically determined. The primitive Christian tradition has placed the first existence of the Church, or, at any rate, the first preaching of Christ in Rome, even as far back as the days of the earthly life of Christ. It is said that the wonderful career of Jesus in Judea was first made known by rumors, then by various eye-witnesses, and then by Barnabas (see CLEMENS ROM., *Recognit.* i. 6 sqq.)*

This old Christian legend is closely followed by the Romish ecclesiastical tradition, according to which the Apostle Peter founded the church of Rome. Peter is said to have gone to Rome in the second year of Claudius (A. D. 42) for the overthrow of Simon Magus, and to have resided twenty-five years in Rome as the first bishop of the church established there by him.†

The grounds against this tradition are well known: (1.) When Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, about the year 59, Peter was not yet in Rome, and had never been there (comp. Acts xix. 21; Rom. xv. 20 f.; 2 Cor. x. 16). [For it was the principle and practice of Paul not to interfere with the labors of the Jewish apostles, or to build on another man's foundation. —P. S.] (2.) When Paul, according to the Acts of the Apostles, came to Rome, about the year 62, he found no trace of Peter there. (3.) There was likewise no trace of Peter in Rome when he wrote from that city his Second Epistle to Timothy, which we must safely assign to his second captivity—about the year 66. On the contrary, we find (4.) Peter still in Jerusalem at the time of the Apostolic Council, about the year 53 [50]. We meet him, (5.) still later, in Antioch, according to Gal. ii.—about the year 55. And latest, (6.) in Babylon (in Assyria), where he wrote his First Epistle to the Christians of Asia Minor.‡

But the Second Epistle of Peter, composed in anticipation of his approaching death, seems to have been written from a prison, and that a prison in Rome; and the ecclesiastical tradition of Dionysius of Corinth (EUSEB., *Histor. Eccl.*, ii. 25), which affirms that Peter died a martyr in Rome simultaneously with Paul, cannot be set aside by any weighty arguments. Yet MEYER makes the excellent remark, that the Epistle to the Romans—which implies the impossibility of Peter's presence in Rome before it was written—*is a fact which destroys the historical foundation of the Papacy*, so far as it pretends to rest on that Apostle's establishment and episcopal government of that church.

* [The Barnabas spoken of by Pseudo-Clemens, *Recogn.*, l. i. c. 7, is called a Hebrew by birth, and one of the disciples of Jesus, sent by Him to the West to announce the glad tidings. But this and other pseudo-Clementine legends are of no historical value whatever. It is *certain*, however, that the Jews of Rome were represented on the day of Pentecost in Jerusalem (Acts ii. 10), and it is highly *probable* that they brought the first report of Christianity to Rome, *possibly* as converts, and in this case forming the nucleus of a *Jewish* Christian congregation. See below.—P. S.]

† On the gradual rise of this legend, see WIESELER, *Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters*, p. 552 ff.; and SCHAFF, *History of the Apost. Church*, § 93, p 362 ff. The historical value of this tradition has been given up, even by some Roman Catholic writers [*e. g.*, HUG, FEILMOSER, KLEE, and others mentioned by THOLUCK in his Comm on the Romans, p. 1, who do not, like BAUR, deny that Peter was ever at Rome, but only that he founded the church of Rome.—P. S.] But, on the other hand, there are Protestant divines, such as BERTHOLDT, MYNSTER, and THIERSCH (*The Church in the Apost. Age*, 1852, p. 97), who have endeavored to sustain it, and it is easy to see why the Romanists of the present day return to the support of the legend (see HAGEMANN, *Die römische Kirche*, Freib., p. 658 ff.).

‡ On the untenability of the hypothesis that Babylon means Rome, see my *Apost. Zeitalter*, ii. p 380.

The tradition which transfers the Roman church back to the days of Jesus, has been carried out to an extreme in several fictions.*

Yet there is an element of truth at its root, viz., the fact that the Messianic hope of the Jews in Rome was early excited, perhaps during the earthly life of Jesus, by a historical knowledge of His appearance; for among any considerable number of Jews there were pious individuals waiting for the Messiah's coming. "It is now admitted on all hands," says THOLUCK, "that the seeds of the gospel could be brought to Rome by the Jews who were present at the feast of Pentecost (Acts ii. 10), and by the Jewish Christians who were scattered in different directions after the martyrdom of Stephen (Acts viii. 1). Such an early period is substantiated by the mention of such Christian teachers in Rome as had been converted before Paul (chap. xvi. 7); by what the Apostle says of the wide-spread renown of the Church (chap. i. 8), and its wide extent, since they met together in various places of the metropolis, chap. xvi. 5; xiv. 15; and finally by the probability that, in consequence of the great influx of foreigners to Rome, Christians from a distance were early found among the number."

The Jewish population in Rome was one of the larger colonies, like those in Assyria, Babylon, Alexandria, etc. Its parent stock were the Jewish slaves that had been brought by Pompey to Rome. It increased from the beginning by Jewish travellers, and afterwards by numerous proselytes. The enslaved Jews had, for the most part, received their freedom under AUGUSTUS.†

The Emperor TIBERIUS (SUETON., *Tib.* 36; JOSEPH., *Antiq.* xviii. 3. 5), and subsequently CLAUDIUS, drove them from the city (Acts xviii. 2; SUETON., *Claud.* 25); but they soon returned in great numbers, and dwelt under the rule of later emperors, although severely oppressed by taxes (SUETON., *Domit.* 12), and, in part, miserably poor (JUVENAL, iii. 14; vi. 542). "Under the reigns of AUGUSTUS, TIBERIUS, and NERO, there were Jews even in the imperial household; and POPPÆA, NERO's wife, was herself attached to the Jewish faith. So great was the number of Jews in Rome, that the Jewish embassy sent to AUGUSTUS after the death of HEROD, was joined by eight thousand Jews in Rome (JOSEPH., *Antiq.* xvii. 11, 1)." (THOLUCK.) On the celebrated mysterious word of SUETONIUS concerning a decree of the Emperor Claudius in the year 52: "*Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit,*" comp. NEANDER, *Kirchengesch.* i. p. 52.‡

* See NEANDER, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. p. 51. Tertullian's legend of the Emperor Tiberius. [TERT., *Apolog.* c. 5. *Tiberius, cuius tempore nomen Christianum in seculum introivit, adnunciata sibi ex Syria Palestina, quæ illic veritatem ipsius divinitatis revelaverant, detulit ad Senatum cum prærogativa suffragii sui. Senatus, quia non ipse probaverat, respuit, Cæsar in sententia mansit, comminatus periculum accusatoribus Christianorum.* In ch. 21, TERTULLIAN traces the knowledge of Tiberius to a report of Pontius Pilate, and adds that even the emperors would have believed in Christ, if either emperors were not necessary for the world, or if Christians could be emperors. EUSEBIUS, *H. E.* ii. 2, translates the former passage of TERTULLIAN. Before him, JUSTIN MARTYR, *Apol.* i. c. 35 and 48, spoke of acts of Pilate on the last days of Christ. Comp. the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, and EPIPHAN. *Hær.* L. c. 1.—P. S.]

† PHILO, *Leg. ad Caj.* On their dwelling-place in the *Regio transtiberina*, comp. WINER, art. *Rom.*

‡ [The edict of CLAUDIUS *de pellendis Judæis*, mentioned by SUETONIUS, *Claud.* c. 25, and in Acts xviii. 2 (comp. DION CASSIUS, *Hist. Rom.* lx. 6), is usually understood to embrace the (Jewish) Christians as well as the Jews, on the ground that *Chrestus* is a corrupt spelling for *Christus*, and that *tumultuantes* refers to the controversies excited by the introduction of Christianity. To this may be objected, (1.) that SUETONIUS (whom PLINY, *Epist.* x. 95, calls *virum eruditissimum*) must have known the name of Christ as well as TACITUS (*Annal.* xv. 44), and PLINY (x. 96); for he called His disciples *Christiani* (*Nero*, c. 16); (2.) that an internal religious controversy of the Jews would require *inter se* after *tumultuantes;* and (3.) that such a controversy would hardly have justified an edict of expulsion. Hence MEYER (ad Act. xviii. 2) and WIESELER (*Chronology of the Apost. Age*, p. 122, and art. *Römerbrief*, in HERZOG's *Encyclop.*, vol. xx. p. 585) understand by *Chrestus* a Jew who stirred up a political rebellion in Rome during the reign of Claudius. But I prefer the usual opinion, for the following reasons: (1.) There is no trace of such a character, who must have been a false Messiah, and could hardly have remained unknown; (2.) the use of the vulgar misnomer *Chrestus* (Χρηστός), for *Christus*, is established by the testimony of TERTULLIAN (*Ad nat.* i. 3; *Apol.* c. 3: "*Sed et cum perperam* CHRESTIANUS *pronunciatur a vobis—nam nec nominis certa est notitia penes vos—de suavitate vel benignitate compositum est*"), and LACTANTIUS (*Inst. div.* iv. 7: . . . "*propter ignorantium errorem, qui eum immutata litera* CHRESTUM *solent dicere*"). But it seems that the law of CLAUDIUS was no rigorously executed, from apprehension of bad effects in view of the large number of the Jews; and that only the public assemblies were closed. This is stated by DION CASSIUS, lx. 6, who probably refers to the same edict, as LEHMANN and WIESELER assume (τούς τε Ἰουδαίους πλεονάσαντας αὖθις, ὥστε χαλεπῶς ἂν ἄνευ ταραχῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου σφῶν τῆς πόλεως εἰρχθῆναι, οὐκ ἐξήλασε μὲν, τῷ δὲ δὴ πατρίῳ νόμῳ βίῳ χρωμένους ἐκέλευσε μὴ συναθροίζεσθαι), unless we assign this decree (with MEYER and LECHLER, *ad Act.* xviii. 2) to an earlier date. At all events, the edict, if it applied to the Christians at all, can only have had a temporary effect; for we find, a few years afterwards, a large Christian congrega-

At the time when the Apostle wrote his Epistle to the Romans, there were in Rome many converts who openly professed Christ (chap. i.), and met for worship in several houses (chap. xvi.). [The congregation, moreover, must have already existed several years *before* 58, since Paul "these many years" (ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐτῶν, Rom. xv. 23, comp. ver. 22 and i. 13) had a desire to visit them, and since he mentions, among the Christian teachers in Rome, such as had been converted before him, xvi. 7.—P. S.] The stock of this Christian community was no doubt of Jewish descent (iv. 1); but the Gentile Christian element also was considerable (Rom. xi 13 ff., 25), as we may expect in view of the large number of Jewish proselytes in Rome. We may safely assume that the Church was just as much founded by Gentile Christians from Antioch, as by Jewish Christians who witnessed the first Pentecost at Jerusalem. We learn moreover, from chap. xvi., that the most prominent members of the Church were adherents of Paul. And there is every probability that Paul, in a comprehensive church policy, had prepared the way for the proper founding and organization of a united congregation in Rome, as in Ephesus, by previously sending out faithful disciples—Aquila and his wife Priscilla. As these were his pioneers in Ephesus, so were they in Rome. Says MEYER [on *Rom.*, p. 21, 4th ed.]: "As Paul had been so eminently successful in Greece, it was very natural that apostolic men from his school should bear evangelic truth further westward, to the metropolis of heathendom. The banishment of the Jews from Rome under Claudius (SUETON., *Claud.* 25; Acts xviii. 2) was a special occasion made use of by Providence for that end. Fugitives to neighboring Greece became Christians, and disciples of Paul; and, after their return to Rome, were heralds of Christianity, and took part in organizing a congregation. This is historically proved by the example of Aquila and Priscilla, who, when Jews, emigrated to Corinth, lived there over a year and a half in the company of Paul, and subsequently appeared as teachers in Rome and occupants of a house where the Roman congregation assembled (Rom. xvi. 3). Probably other individuals mentioned in chap. xvi. were led by God in a similar way; but it is certain that Aquila and Priscilla occupied a most important position among the founders of the congregation; for among the many teachers whom Paul greets in chap. xvi., he presents his first greeting to them, and this, too, with such flattering commendation as he bestows upon none of the rest."

The much-disputed question concerning the national and religious constituents of the Roman Church is intimately connected with the question as to the occasion and aim of the Epistle to the Romans.

In discussing this point, we must start with certain clear distinctions. The difference between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians must not be confounded with the difference between non-Pauline and Pauline Christians. Aquila and Priscilla, for example, were Jewish Christians, but they belonged decidedly to the school of Paul. On the contrary, there were in the Galatian congregation Gentile Christians who permitted themselves to be estranged from the Apostle Paul by the Judaizing party spirit. Likewise, those weak brethren or Jewish Christians who were entangled in legalistic anxiety (ἀσθενεῖς), must be distinguished from the false brethren, or heretical Ebionites, who gradually come into view; and so must we distinguish, among the Gentile Christians, those who were genuine disciples of Paul from those who proudly advocated an antinomian freedom of conscience. Even among the rigidly legalistic Christians there arose very early an antagonism between the adherents of Pharisaic legality and Essenic holiness.

It is clear, not only from historical relations, but also from the present Epistle, that the national Jewish element in the Roman Church must have been very important, and that it constituted the first basis of the Church; see chap. ii. 17 ff.; iv. 1 ff.; vii. 4 ff.

tion at Rome, composed of converts from the Jews and Gentiles, as is evident from the Epistle to the Romans, from the return of AQUILA and PRISCILLA (Rom. xvi. 3), from Acts xviii. 17 ff., and from TACITUS's account of the Neronian persecution in July, 64. CLAUDIUS issued several edicts concerning the Jews, first favorable ones in the year 42, mentioned by JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.* xix, 5, 2, 3; then the edict of expulsion, A. D. 52 (SUETON., *Claud.* 25; Acts xviii. 2), with which probably the one mentioned by DION CASSIUS, lx. 6, is identical. The silence of JOSEPHUS concerning the latter edict is the more easily explained from the fact that, like the contemporary edict *de mathematicis Italia pellendis* (noticed by TACITUS, *Annal.* xii. 52), it was never fully executed, or else speedily recalled.—P. S.]

At the same time, however, the Gentile Christian element in the Roman Church had become very strong, and was perhaps predominant. This we must infer from the historical relation. "Christianity, which took root first among the Jews, found an easier entrance in Rome among the heathen, because, in Rome, the popular heathen religion had already incurred the contempt of both the cultivated and ignorant classes (see GIESELER, *Ch. Hist.* i. § 11–14); therefore the inclination to Monotheism was very common, and the multitude of those who came over to the Jewish faith was very large (JUVENAL, *Satyr.* x. 96 ff.; TACIT., *Ann.* xv. 44; *Hist.* v. 5; SENECA in AUGUSTINE, *De Civ. Dei*, vii. 11; JOSEPH., *Antiq.* xviii. 3, 5). But how much more must this liberal religion, so elevated above all the bonds of a repulsive legal rigorism, as it was preached by Aquilas and other Pauline teachers, receive attention and support at the hands of those Romans who were discontented with heathendom." (MEYER.) That this was really the fact in the Roman church, is evinced by the many appeals addressed to the Gentile Christian portion, chap. i. 5, 6, 13; chap. xi. 13 ff.

Both elements in the Church must have been strong, as appears from the fact that the Apostle places together, throughout the Epistle, Jews and Gentiles, Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians, in order to bring them into union and harmony, as, from a different fundamental thought, he did in the Epistle to the Ephesians. In the greetings and introduction we find Jewish and Gentile Christians spoken of with equal regard. The theme of the Epistle, chap. i. 14–17, expressly applies the gospel alike to Jews and Greeks. In the exposition of the unrighteousness of the human race, the Gentiles and Jews are placed together in the light of searching truth, chap. i. 18; iii. 20. Likewise, justification by faith is applied in the most positive manner to Jews as well as Gentiles, chap. iii. 21–v. 11. Also the participation in the death of Adam and in the new life in Christ, chap. v. 12–viii. 39. So, likewise, the two economies of judgment and mercy in the history of the world, chaps. ix.–xi. Even in the exhortation the distinction again appears; the weak in faith and the free; the severe and the scornful; the weak and the stong, chaps. xiv.–xv. 7; yet here the other opposition between the non-Pauline and the Pauline Christians is also taken into account.

Though we cannot say with absolute certainty that the Gentile Christian portion of the Roman church was predominant, yet it is plain that the Pauline type did predominate in such a measure that the Apostle looked upon the church, in spirit, as *his* church. If we look at the single congregations in private houses, which the Apostle greets in chap. xvi., we find Aquila and Priscilla at the head of the first mentioned, which was probably the most prominent; and these were Jewish Christians, and yet decidedly Pauline. Likewise the warm and friendly terms with which he greets the most of the others, prove that he could regard them as his spiritual companions in the strictest sense of the word. This can be seen here and there from the contents of the Epistle. As the Apostle regarded himself, with justice, in the most specific sense, as the chosen Apostle to the Gentiles (chap. i. 5—a consciousness which, according to Gal. ii., involved neither a conflict with the apostles of the Jews, nor a neglect by Paul of the Jewish synagogues), he must have looked very early to the Roman metropolis as a sphere of labor designed for him. Accordingly, he designed at a very early period to establish a mission in Rome (Acts xix. 21; Rom. i. 13). He also made timely preparations for the execution of this design by sending in advance his friends Aquila and Priscilla, and many other companions—among them the deaconess Phœbe, of Corinth—to Rome. For this very reason he could depart, with regard to the Romans, from his usual practice of making his personal apostolic labor precede a written communication. This time he could send an epistle first, and write to the Roman Christians τολμηροτέρως ἀπὸ μέρους (chap. xv. 15) without being embarassed by the thought that he was entering upon a foreign field of labor (chap. xv. 20). Nevertheless, that delicacy with which he regarded the rights and independence of others, especially of believers, induced him to characterize his visit to Rome merely as a journey through that city to Spain. He could expect, with tolerable certainty, that Rome would be his principal station; but in case the prevailing peculiarities of the church should prevent this, he could not be denied in Rome the rights of Christian hospitality, by the aid of which he could proceed further. But the Judaizing element is

the church was not important nor far advanced, as appears from the fact that he found it necessary only to oppose legalistic anxiety in reference to fast-days and the eating of food—not arrogant Judaistic dogmas.

The congregation being composed of Jewish and Gentile Christians, it could easily occur that the theological opinions at one time leaned to one side, and then to another.

According to PALEY, HENKE, KOPPE, KREHL, BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS, and THIERSCH, the Jewish Christian element predominated in the church; and BAUR, favoring his well-known Ebionitic hypothesis, has attributed to the church a mild form of Ebionism.* For an extended refutation of this view, which is sustained by a distortion of different passages, see THOLUCK's *Romans*, p. 8 ff. MEYER, in his introduction, passes lightly over the attacks of BAUR. We have no right to judge the character of the congregation at the time of Paul by the Judaizing tendencies which subsequently gained the ascendency there in conformity with the constitutional proclivity of the Roman nationality. And even in the second century the Roman church, as such, cannot be charged with Ebionism (see THOLUCK, p. 7).

According to NEANDER, RÜCKERT, DE WETTE, OLSHAUSEN, and MEYER, the Gentile Christian element was predominant. But even MEYER confounds this view with the preponderance of Pauline Christianity in Rome. We must discriminate thus: The Gentile Christian element was strong, but the Pauline element was evidently preponderant. This was also the case still later, when Paul wrote his Epistle to the Philippians during his captivity in Rome, although here, as elsewhere in the churches after the year 60, the Jewish element increased in strength (Phil. i). Subsequently, the short stay of Peter in Rome, as well as the larger elective affinity between Jewish Christianity and the Roman nationality, gradually weakened the Pauline type, and, in fine, obscured it.

If there had been already a large number of Jewish Christians in Rome, how could the chiefs of the Jews speak to the Apostle when he came to Rome just as they did, according to Acts xxviii. 21, 22? Their answer was plainly evasive, in which they adhere to two points: that no writing of complaint against Paul had been sent to them from Jerusalem; and that the Christians were everywhere opposed by the Jews as a sect. BAUR and ZELLER have endeavored to derive from this apparent "contradiction" between the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Romans, a decisive proof of the unhistorical character of the Acts. For a refutation of this argument, see KLING, *Studien und Kritiken* for 1837, p. 301 ff.: THOLUCK, *Comment.*, p. 10 ff.; MEYER, p. 20; my *Apost. Zeitalter*, i. p. 106, and others.

[The argument of the late Dr. BAUR, and ZELLER (his son-in-law), is this: The flourishing condition of the Christian Church at Rome, as described in the Epistle to the Romans (i. 8, 11, 12; xv. 1, 14, 15; xvi. 19), is irreconcilable with the tone used by the leading Roman Jews (*οἱ πρῶτοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων*) in their answer to Paul, Acts xxviii. 21, 22, where they plead ignorance of the antecedents of the Apostle, and contemptuously characterize the Christian religion as a sect (*αἵρεσις*) which met everywhere with contradiction (*πανταχοῦ ἀντιλέγεται*); consequently the author of the Acts must have misrepresented the real state of things in the interest of his doctrinal design, which was to effect a compromise between the Jewish Christian or Petrine, and the Gentile Christian or Pauline sections of the Church, by bringing Paul down to the Petrine or Jewish Christian standpoint, and by liberalizing Peter, and making both meet halfway. But, in the first place, the author of the Acts (which were certainly not written before 63 or 64—*i. e*, six or seven years after the Romans) must have known the Epistle to the Romans, and felt the contradiction, if there was any, as well as we, the more

* [The same view as to the preponderance of the Jewish element has been ably defended since by W. MANGOLD, *Der Römerbrief und die Anfänge der Röm. Gemeinde*, 1866, p. 35 ff.; but he justly denies the hypothesis of BAUR, that the Jewish Christians in Rome were *Ebionites*. SCHOTT, on the contrary, differs from BAUR and MANGOLD in assuming that the Epistle to the Romans was mainly intended for *Gentile* Christians. All three agree as to the *aim* and *object* of the Epistle, which was to justify Paul's apostolate to the Gentiles, by explaining the peculiar features of his doctrine and removing the objections to it, and thus to prepare the way not only for a personal visit to Rome, but also for a new missionary activity in the West, with Rome as the centre (comp. MANGOLD, *l. c.* p. 141). But MANGOLD objects to SCHOTT that such a justification was unnecessary for Gentile Christians, and hence he presupposes Jewish Christians.—P. S.]

so as he himself had previously mentioned the existence of the Christian congregation in Rome (xxviii. 15). Hence, the apparent contradiction, far from exposing a wilful perversion of history, only proves the simplicity and veracity of the narrative, and tends, like so many similar instances, to confirm rather than to weaken our faith. (2.) The very manner in which the Jews speak of Christianity as a sect *everywhere* spoken against, implies its general spread at that time, and so far corroborates the statement of Paul. (3.) The Jews did not say that they had never heard of Paul at all (which would be inconsistent with their own statement concerning the contradiction raised everywhere against Christianity), but only that they had received no (official) information from Palestine which affected his moral character, or was unfavorable to him personally (τι περὶ σοῦ πονηρόν). And this was no doubt true; for the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem could have no reason to send official communication to the Jewish community in Rome concerning the case of Paul, before he had appealed to the tribunal of Cæsar, and after this appeal they could not well anticipate the arrival of the Apostle in Rome, as he left Cæsarea soon after the appeal, at an advanced season of the year, shortly before the *mare clausum* (comp. Acts xxv. 12, 13; xxvii. 1, 9), and, in all probability, before his enemies could even make out the necessary official papers. (4.) We must not forget the diplomatic and evasive character of the answer of the Jews, who, as prudent men, were reluctant to commit themselves unnecessarily before the trial, in view of the imperial court and authority, and the complicated difficulties of the case. The leaders of the Jews appeared on this occasion in an official capacity, and very properly (from their own standpoint) observed an official reserve.—P. S.]

§ 3. THE CERTIFICATION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. ITS GENUINENESS AND INTEGRITY.

The Epistle of Paul to the Romans belongs to the most indisputable books of the New Testament.

Its *genuineness* is certified in the strongest manner by the unanimous testimony of the ancient Church, by the harmony of its contents with the historical character of Paul, by its internal weight, and its great influence upon the Church. Even the criticism of BAUR, which rejects the most of the New Testament books, acknowledges the genuineness of this Epistle (with the exception of the last two chapters), besides the Epistles to the Corinthians and that to the Galatians. But here, as elsewhere, the testimony of this criticism is not of much account. Significant allusions to the Epistle can be found in the (first) epistle of CLEMENT of Rome; in IGNATIUS, POLYCARP, JUSTIN MARTYR, etc. MARCION, the Gnostic, acknowledged it. A decided testimony in favor of this Epistle is rendered by the three great witnesses of the Church and of the New Testament in its principal parts—IRENÆUS, TERTULLIAN, and CLEMENT of Alexandria. ORIGEN wrote a commentary on this Epistle. Even the fact that the Judaizing sects rejected it, speaks indirectly in its favor; they hated the Pauline doctrine contained in it.*

On the other hand, the *integrity* of the Epistle has been variously opposed. MARCION rejected chaps. xv. and xvi. on doctrinal grounds. HEUMANN, in his exposition of the New Testament, maintains that the Epistle closed, as a first epistle, with chap. xi., and that the subsequent part is a new work of Paul. SEMLER wrote: *De duplici adpendice Epistolæ Pauli ad Romanos.* According to PAULUS of Heidelberg, chap. xv. is a special epistle to the *enlightened* Christians in Rome; chap. xvi. is a special writing to the officers. Diverse, and, in fact, very strange conjectures have been advanced by SCHULZ and SCHOTT on chap. xvi. J. C. CHR. SCHMIDT denied the genuineness of the doxology, chap. xvi. 25–27, because it is wanting in Codex F. etc.; because it is erased in other codices; and because, in Codex J., and in almost all the Minuscule MSS., it stands after chap. xiv. 23. REICHE supposes that the

* More recently, the Englishman EVANSON, in his book on the *Discrepancies of the Four Gospels*, has incidentally attacked the genuineness of the Epistle to the Romans, with trifling remarks unworthy of refutation; besides him, BRUNO BAUER [a half-cracked pseudo-critic of Berlin, not to be confounded with the far superior Dr. FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR of Tübingen.—P. S.]

public reading of the Epistle should only extend to chap. xiv. 23, because what follows is of less practical importance, and for this reason the former part has been concluded by the doxology, which subsequently was made to conclude the whole Epistle. It would have been more appropriate to reason: Since the public reading was often concluded with chap. xiv. 23, the doxology was transferred from the end of the whole Epistle to this place. This would explain the fact that it is to be found, in later codices, after chap. xiv. 23. BAUR, in his treatise on the *Purpose and Occasion of the Epistle to the Romans*, declares chaps. xv. and xvi. of the Epistle to be ungenuine. Certainly these chapters interfere with the application of his Ebionitic hypothesis to the condition of the Roman church. He was refuted by KLING in the *Studien und Kritiken* (1837, No. 2), and by OLSHAUSEN (1838, No. 4). Even the circumstance that the pseudo-Clementine Homilies seem to present a different picture of the Roman Church was made by BAUR a decisive argument against the genuineness of the last two chapters of the Epistle!

As far as the *language* of the Epistle is concerned, many Roman Catholic theologians have made use of the note of the Syrian scholiast on the Peshito: Paul wrote his epistle in *Roman*, in order to assert that it was originally written in Latin. GROTIUS, and others, with good reason, have understood the word *Roman* in the wider sense, as applied to the Greek language. "The Greek composition," says MEYER, "corresponds perfectly not only to the Hellenic culture of the Apostle himself, but also to the linguistic relations of Rome (see CREDNER, *Einl.* ii., p. 383 ff.), and to the analogy of the remaining early Christian literature directed to Rome (IGNATIUS, JUSTIN, IRENÆUS, HIPPOLYTUS, and others)." BOLTEN and BERTHOLD assert that the Epistle was originally written in the Aramæan language. For further information, see MEYER, REICHE, and others, especially also the Introductions to the New Testament.*

§ 4. OCCASION, PURPOSE, AND CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

The origin of the Epistle to the Romans must be traced to the close connection between the call and consciousness of Paul as the Apostle to the Gentiles, and Rome as the great metropolis of the Gentile world. But the contents of the Epistle are determined by the fact that a church made up of both Jewish and Gentile Christians already existed in Rome, and that he had long ago prepared the way for his personal labors in Rome, and further west, by sending out his missionary assistants and companions. His Epistle starts with this preparation as a preliminary reflexion of his personal labors; that is, as the promulgation of the gospel both in its theocratic purpose and in its universal constitution. In other words, he exhibits the gospel in its eminent fitness to comprehend Jews and Gentiles in a common necessity of salvation, and to build them up, on the common ground of salvation, into a community of faith which would combine in perfect harmony both a theocratic purpose and a universal spirit.

It was natural that Paul, in view of his call to the Gentile world, should, very early in his career, look to the metropolis of Rome as his great aim. He longed and strove to go to Rome, ch. xv. 23; i. 11. The order of his apostolic labors required him first to exercise his apostolic office in the East, chap. xv. 19; Acts xix. 21. Accordingly, his three Oriental missionary journeys had to be undertaken first, though in them he gradually approached the West; and besides, after each of these missionary tours, he had to secure the connection of his work with the metropolis at Jerusalem by a return to this city; but, in addition to all this, he experienced many vexatious annoyances, and therefore he could well speak of the great hindrances to the execution of his design (chap. i. 13; xv. 22). Since it was his pur

* [On the general use of the Greek language in the age of the apostles, within the limits of the Roman Empire, comp. especially the learned work of Dr. ALEXANDER ROBERTS, *Discussions on the Gospels*, Cambridge and London, 2d ed. 1864, pp. 1–316. Dr. ROBERTS endeavors to prove, from the undeniable facts of the New Testament, that even in Palestine, at the time of Christ, Greek was the common language of public intercourse, and that Christ and the apostles spoke for the most part in Greek, and only now and then in Aramaic. If this be so, we have, in the Gospels, not a translation, but the original words of our Saviour as He spoke them to the people and to the Twelve.—P. S.]

pose, after his third missionary journey, to proceed from Jerusalem to Rome, his arrest in Jerusalem and imprisonment in Cæsarea contributed to carry out this design, although it was for a time a new obstacle in his way; and his appeal to Cæsar (Acts xxv. 10) was not only a requirement of necessity, but a great step toward the consummation of his wishes. But in Rome, too, there had arisen a hindrance in the establishment of an important society of Christians without his coöperation. He removed this hindrance in a threefold way. First, by sending his spiritual friends, Aquila and Priscilla, in advance to Rome, in order to prepare a place of abode for him; secondly, by his letter; thirdly, by the extension of his missionary purpose to Spain; so that, at all events, he might visit the congregation in Rome without doing violence to his apostolic principle (chap. xv. 20). His imprisonment set aside the last difficulty, since it even compelled him to stay two years in Rome; although he did not give up his plan of going further to Spain.

The occasion and purpose of the Epistle to the Romans has been very much and very differently discussed both by commentators and in special treatises.*

"The dogmatic exposition of earlier times," says THOLUCK, "which was not at all interested in inquiring after the real historical purposes, mostly identified the aim and the argument of the Biblical books; in that which the Divine Spirit directed the writer to record, there lay the purpose for Christendom in all ages. The historical exposition of modern times seeks, by comparing the contents with the historical situation from which the writings arose, to disclose the nearest purpose to the original readers, although some writers of the rationalistic school put external cause in the place of the internal, and contented themselves with merely accidental causes, such as the good opportunity to send a letter to Rome by the departure of Phœbe, the Corinthian deaconess; the sight of the Adriatic sea from the high coast of Illyria, and the desire thereby awakened to go to Rome (PAULUS of Heidelberg)."

The further account by THOLUCK, however, does not fully harmonize with the assumption that earlier writers had in view only a doctrinal occasion, while the more recent commentation start from an historical one.†

* Among the essays on this subject are those by CHRIST. FRIED. SCHMID (*Tübinger Weinachtsprogramm*, 1834, *De Paulinæ ad Romanos Epistolæ consilio et argumento*); by BAUR (*Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefs*, in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift*, 1836, No. 3), and his followers (see THOLUCK, p. 16); by OLSHAUSEN (in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1838, p. 953); by HUTHER (*Zweck und Inhalt der zwölf ersten Kapitel des Römerbriefs*, 1846); and THEOD. SCHOTT (*Der Römerbrief, seinem Endzweck und Gedankengang nach ausgelegt*, Erlangen, 1858).—[Since then appeared D. WILHELM MANGOLD, *The Epistle to the Romans, and the Beginnings of the Roman Congregation: A critical Investigation*, Marburg, 1866, pp. 183; and W. BEYSCHLAG, *The Historical Problem of the Epistle to the Romans*, in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1867, pp. 627–665. The views of the late Dr. BAUR on the Aim and Occasion of the Epistle to the Romans, were first published at Tübingen, 1836, and substantially reproduced in his work on Paul, 1845, p. 332 ff., as well as in his Church History of the first three Centuries, 2d ed., 1860, p. 62 ff.; but in this last work, and in the second edition of the monograph on St. Paul (1867), he moderates the alleged antagonism of the Jewish Christians at Rome against Paul, and no more insists on the opinion that chapters ix.-xi. constitute the doctrinal essence of the whole Epistle, to which the rest was made to serve merely as an introduction and an application. It must be admitted that Dr. BAUR, by striking critical combinations, broke a new field of investigation concerning the character and condition of the primitive Christians in Rome, and the aim and occasion of the Epistle to the Romans. THEODOR SCHOTT, of Erlangen, agreeing with BAUR as to the central significance of chaps. ix., x., and xi., but differing from his untenable assumption of the preponderance of the Jewish element in the Roman congregation, represents the Epistle as an apology of the Gentile apostolate of Paul before *Gentile* Christians of the Pauline school. But these did not need any such apology. MANGOLD, in the able treatise just referred to, substantially renews the view of BAUR as to the essentially *Jewish* Christian character of the Church of Rome, and the importance of chaps. ix.-xi., but he moderates its supposed antagonism to Paul. BAUR, SCHOTT, and MANGOLD agree in giving the Epistle an apologetic aim, viz., the defence of Paul's apostolate of the Gentiles (*Die Rechtfertigung des paulinischen Heidenapostolats*). In this, BEYSCHLAG differs from them, and, without denying this apologetic aim, he yet subordinates it (with THOLUCK, OLSHAUSEN, DE WETTE, and others) to the general dogmatic aim of a systematic exhibition of the gospel salvation to a prevailingly Gentile Christian congregation in the metropolis of the world. In doing this, however, the Apostle had evidently his eye mainly upon the settlement of the difficult problem touching the relation of God's ancient people to the recently-engrafted Gentile world on the broad basis of God's infinite wisdom and mercy in the unfolding of His plan of redemption. Thus, chaps. ix.-xi. receive their proper position as an outline of a philosophy of church history, instead of being merely regarded as a parenthetical section. Compare Dr. LANGE's views in the text. The English commentators do not trouble themselves much with this introductory question.—P. S.]

† [There were attempts at historical exegesis among the Greek fathers of the Antiochian school, THEODORE of Mopsuestia, CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, and among a few Latin fathers such as JEROME, PSEUDO-AMBROSIUS, and PELAGIUS on the other hand, with some of the modern commentators the doctrinal and practical element predominates.—P. S.]

As far as the historical (more properly defined, special dogmatico-historical) occasions are concerned, AMBROSIASTER, AUGUSTINE, BULLINGER, and BUCER have ascribed to the Epistle a polemical attitude against the Jewish Christians (PELLICAN likewise, though only in the way of caution); and in modern times, EICHHORN, SCHMID, BAUR, SCHWEGLER, ZELLER, KÖSTLIN, LUTTERBECK, DIETLEIN, and THIERSCH have, with many modifications, regarded the Epistle chiefly as a rectification of Jewish and Judaistic principles.

CHRYSOSTOM and THEODORET would find, on the contrary, in the Epistle decided polemic references to Gentile Christian Antinomian errors such as we find among the Marcionites, Valentinians, and Manichæans.

But those are nearer right who suppose that the Epistle was designed for the conciliatory counteraction both of Jewish Christian and Gentile Christian perversions. This view has been defended especially by MELANCHTHON, DU PIN, HUG, and BERTHOLDT. MELANCHTHON says "It can be seen that Paul wrote this Epistle from this cause: that the Jews would appropriate to themselves redemption and eternal life by their own righteousness through the works of the law; and again, the heathen insisted that the Jews were cast off for having rejected Christ."

In opposition to the historical (or better, the special dogmatico-historical) view concerning the occasion of the Epistle, we find the theory of a dogmatic, or, more properly, a universal dogmatico-historical occasion. When the Apostle Paul, in this view, without special references to particular embarrassments in the Roman church, would give to this church an outline of the first elements of the whole gospel—according to his conception of it—he did it under the steady conviction of his universal calling as the special Apostle to the Gentiles, who must extend his labors to the specific city of the Gentiles. On this side belong LUTHER's Preface to his Commentary on the Romans, HEIDEGGER's *Enchiridion*, p. 585, THOLUCK, in the earlier editions of his Commentary, OLSHAUSEN, RÜCKERT, REICHE, KÖLLNER, GLÖCKLER, and PHILIPPI. On the different modifications of this view, see SCHOTT, p. 17. That of OLSHAUSEN is the most clearly defined. "We can affirm," says he [Commentary on the Romans, Introduction, § 5, p. 58, Germ. ed.], "that the Epistle to the Romans contains, so to say, a Pauline system of divinity, since all the essential topics to which the Apostle Paul, in his treatment of the gospel, is accustomed to give special prominence, are here developed at length." PHILIPPI: "The Epistle was designed to take the place of the personal preaching of Paul in Rome; therefore it contains a connected doctrinal statement of the specifically Pauline gospel, such as no other contains."

SCHOTT declares: "I must oppose decidedly, with BAUR, all these views." Yet his protest differs from that of BAUR. By his supposition concerning the Ebionitism of the Roman church, BAUR was misled to the monstrous conclusion, that the theme of the Epistle to the Romans first appears positively in the section from chaps. ix. to xi. (in direct opposition to THOLUCK, who, in his former editions, would find in the same part only a historical corollary). "The ever-increasing number of the Gentile Christians received by Paul must have so far excited the pretensions of the Judaists, that even the reception of the heathen, on condition of circumcision, was no more acceptable to them, and the reception of the heathen was regarded by them as an usurpation, so long as Israel was not converted." SCHOTT controverts the opinion that "the cause and object of the Epistle must be determined from its entire contents," and confines himself to the introductory remarks of the Apostle concerning the purpose and cause of his Epistle. The result of his inquiry into the Proœmium is the following: "As Paul sets out to proclaim his gospel for the Gentiles to the nations of the West, he designs to visit the Christian congregation at Rome, and to enter into a closer personal relation to it by reciprocal acquaintance, with a view to make this congregation of the metropolis of the West a solid base of operation for his Gentile mission work, which was now to begin in the West." But that understanding with the Roman church could be reached in no other way than by "a full exposition of the nature and character of his apostolic office, and the principles by which he was governed in his conduct." SCHOTT finds, therefore, in the Epistle, "not an exposition of the Pauline theory of Christianity, but a description and vindication of the Pauline system of missionary labors.

We object to this view, on the whole, that it puts the historical motive and the doctrinal in a strong contrast which is untenable. Then in particular:

1. The distinction between the East and the West, by which the former is described as the sphere of Jewish Christianity, and the latter, on the other hand, is the sphere in which the Apostle's purely Gentile Christian labors began (p. 102 ff.).

2. The supposition that the Apostle desired, in his Epistle, to lay before the church in Rome a complete apologetic programme of his missionary policy, in order to gain their recognition, and thereby find in them a point of support; but not to proclaim to the church in Rome the gospel as he understood it.

3. He would place the church in Rome, by means of his admonitions, in such a condition that it could become a basis for his Western missionary labors; but he did not intend that Rome itself should be his final object, but merely serve as a point of support for his labors in the West, above all in Spain.

It is above all things improper to separate the historical and the doctrinal cause, or to bring them into opposition. The Apostle to the Gentiles was under no obligation to legitimatize himself before the Roman church concerning his missionary labors in the West; yet, according to the principle of Apostolic order, he had to justify himself when he wrote to the Romans τολμηροτέρως (which certainly does not mean by way of defence, but, with more than usual boldness), and proclaimed to them the gospel. Plainly, the first fundamental thought of the Epistle is this: The call of the Apostle to the Gentiles is a call for Rome, and therefore the Apostle had long made the city of Rome his object. But the second fundamental thought, which limits the first, is the idea of apostolic regulation. The Apostle cannot lay claim to the church as exclusively his own, since it had already long existed without his coöperation. Therefore he describes his anticipated journey as one to the heathen West—to Spain, the limit of the Western pagan world—in which he designs that Rome should furnish him a hospitable stay. Nevertheless, the Apostle was filled with the confidence that he could venture to address Rome as his church, and assuredly as the church in which he had to perfect the universal union of Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity, of Jerusalem and Antioch. Accordingly, he unfolds the religious and moral strength of his gospel, as fully adapted to save Jews and Greeks, and therefore to unite them, since, with the same evidence, it (*a.*) makes Jews and Gentiles sinners alike; (*b.*) presents salvation in Christ with equal certainty to both; (*c.*) leads both from the same death to the new life, as the elect; (*d.*) makes plain their mutual dependence in the same divine economy of salvation (chaps. ix.–xi.); (*e.*) the gospel proves itself to be a power of sanctification for Jews and Gentiles, which can make both capable of being reciprocally sympathetic, and of setting them free from their Jewish and pagan prejudices (chap. xii. ff.). By these combined considerations the Apostle furnishes to the Christians in Rome a real and practical proof that he, as the universal Apostle to the Gentiles, was also called to be indirectly the Apostle of Israel (chap. xi. 13, 14), and of the unity of the Jewish and Gentile Christians; and that Rome, the universal church of Gentile Christians, was called, as such, to become the union church of Jewish and Gentile Christians. And this is to be brought about by the strength of the universal gospel, which unites all the elect, and which, after first announcing it by letter, he hopes soon to present orally, so as to make Rome the point of departure for this universal Christian Church.

The matter stands, therefore, thus: The Apostle, who began his labors as the Apostle to the Jews (Acts ix. 22, 28), and who was afterwards in a special sense the Apostle to the Gentiles (Acts xxii. 21; Gal. ii.), now enters upon the third stage of his activity as the Apostle to all nations, and devotes his attention to the development of a union Church, which should embrace in one Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians.

§ 5. PLACE AND TIME OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE.

It is a very general opinion, and one sustained by various indications, that the Apostle

wrote the Epistle to the Romans from CORINTH, during his stay there, while on his third missionary journey.

According to Rom. xv. 25 ff., the Apostle, when he wrote this Epistle, was about to depart for Jerusalem in charge of the collection from Macedonia and Achaia. But he brought this collection to an end in Corinth, when on his third missionary tour, according to 1 Cor. xvi. 1–3; 2 Cor. ix. This combination refers to the last three months' stay of the Apostle in Achaia (Acts xx. 2), and especially in Corinth; since this city was the metropolis of the church of Achaia, and the Apostle desired to tarry here, according to 1 Cor. xvi. 1–7; 2 Cor. ix. 4; xii. 20; xiii. 2. It is also in favor of Corinth, that the Apostle sent the Epistle by the deaconess Phœbe from the Corinthian seaport Cenchreæ (chap. xvi. 1, 2); that he greets the Roman Christians for his host, Gaius (chap. xvi. 23), whom we may identify with the Corinthian Gaius (1 Cor. i. 14); and also for Erastus, the treasurer of the city, who, according to 2 Tim. iv. 20 (comp. Acts xix. 22), had his home in Corinth. Dr. PAULUS has no ground whatever for arguing from chap. xv. 19, that the Epistle was written in a city of Illyria. MEYER justly supposes that the Epistle was written before the Apostle—who first had the purpose of travelling directly from Achaia to Syria and Jerusalem—was compelled by Jewish persecution to return through Macedonia (see Acts xx. 3); for he mentions, chap xv. 25–31, nothing of this important matter.

The TIME of the composition of the Epistle was therefore about the year 59 after Christ. The notice, Acts xxviii. 21, which seems to imply that the Roman Jews knew nothing of an Epistle of Paul to Rome, by no means justifies the inference (drawn by TOBLER) that the Epistle was written at a later time; comp. against this FLATT and MEYER.

The Epistle was dictated by Paul to Tertius, an assistant (chap. xvi. 22). "The cause why Paul did not write his Epistles with his own hand, is not to be found in his want of practice in writing Greek,—which has no support whatever,—but in the apostolic condition when others were ready to aid him." MEYER. See Gal. vi. 11, and the note of the *Bible-Work in loc.*

§ 6. *The Meaning and Import of the Epistle to the Romans.*

OLSHAUSEN divides the Pauline Epistles into three classes: First, *dogmatical* didactic Epistles, then *practical* didactic Epistles, and finally, *friendly* expressions of his heart. This division is untenable, as appears from the fact that he includes the profound christological Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, together with the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon, in the class of "letters of friendship." It is also very insufficient to say that the Epistle to the Romans belongs to the *dogmatic* didactic class. OLSHAUSEN remarks correctly, that the Epistle to the Romans is most nearly related to that to the Galatians; yet he does not go quite to the point, when he says: "Both Epistles treat of the relation of law and gospel; but while, in Romans, this relation is viewed altogether *objectively*, the Epistle to the Galatians, on the contrary, is altogether *polemical* against the Judaizing Christians. Besides, the Epistle to the Galatians is limited solely to this relation, and treats of the same more briefly than is the case in the Epistle to the Romans. In the Epistle to the Romans, on the other hand, the relation of the law and gospel is developed didactically, and scientifically in the strict sense of the word," etc.

We have already remarked that the two Epistles are to be distinguished as specifically soteriological in the narrower sense of the word; but as the Epistle to the Romans describes justification by faith in Christ in antagonism with universal human depravity, the Epistle to the Galatians, on the contrary, is directed against false justification from the works of the law. At the same time, the Epistle to the Romans is constructed on a broader basis than that to the Galatians, since it deals both with heathenism and Judaism. The Epistle purposes to show, that neither the Gentiles were saved by God's revelation in nature and in the conscience, nor the Jews by the written law of the Old Testament; and he extends human depravity and the counteracting redemption through three stages of development in the most

universal and exhaustive contemplation, to which an equally comprehensive practical application must correspond.

Although the Epistle to the Romans belongs, in the chronological order, in the middle of the Pauline Epistles, yet its primacy has been recognized in manifest opposition to the alleged primacy of the Roman Bishop. The Epistle to the Romans, in its Pauline type, opposes, by its doctrine of justification by faith without the works of the law, the system of Rome; so that even to-day it can be regarded as an Epistle especially directed "to the Romans."

The early Church, in its disposition of the New Testament canon, especially the so-called "*Apostolos* [as distinct from the "*Gospel*"], placed the Epistle to the Romans, because of its importance, and with regard, at the same time, to the high standing of the Roman congregation, at the head of the Pauline Epistles. Still more did the Reformation bring it into its proper light. "It was," says THOLUCK, "from the fundamental truth developed in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, that the Reformation took its start in its opposition to the Judaism which had crept into the Christian Church. Thus the doctrine of justification by faith became its dogmatic centre. Hence the importance attached to this Epistle by the Protestant Church. The exposition of this Epistle was Melanchthon's favorite course of lectures, which he repeated again and again almost without interruption; and, as Demosthenes did with Thucydides, he twice transcribed this Epistle with his own hand, in order to impress it more deeply on his memory (STROBEL, *Literaturgeschichte der Loci Melanchthon's*, p. 18). Since he here found a development of the chief articles of the Christian faith, he based on the Epistle to the Romans the first doctrinal system of the renovated Church, MELANCHTHON'S *Loci Communes*, 1521. Henceforth the Epistle was regarded as a compendium of Biblical dogmatics, and under this point of view, OLSHAUSEN also advises to begin exegetical studies with the same. But following the succession of thought from chap. i. 11, we would rather find in it a *Christian Philosophy of Universal History* (comp. BAUR, *Paulus*, p. 657)." By the latter construction, however, the christological ἀρχή, as well as the eschatological τέλος, would receive too little attention. The soteriology is certainly pictured forth with its opposite, ponerology, in the most comprehensive way; and both heathendom and Judaism are described under a point of view which comprehends them both. OLSHAUSEN is of the opinion that LUTHER commented only on the Epistle to the Galatians, because the relation between the law and the gospel are treated exclusively in it, and because he would avoid discussion on the mysterious doctrine of predestination (Rom. ix. ff.). But LUTHER certainly expressed himself pointedly enough elsewhere on predestination. [*De servo arbitrio*, against ERASMUS.] The Epistle to the Galatians lay nearer to his purpose, because this Epistle brings out the doctrine of justification by faith in the strongest and clearest contrast to the false justification by works. From LUTHER'S own preface to the Epistle to the Romans we learn how highly he appreciated that Epistle. On the importance of the Epistle for the Church in its inclination to legalism, and in its relation to the personal experience of Paul, and on its difficulties, see OLSHAUSEN, p. 54 ff.

[S. T COLERIDGE, in his *Table-Talk* (June 15, 1833), calls St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans "the most profound work in existence," and says: "The only fit commentator on Paul was LUTHER—not by any means such a gentleman as the Apostle, but almost as great a genius."—P S.]

§ 7. THE CONTENTS AND DIVISION.

A. *The Contents.*

The Epistle to the Romans—in its sixteen chapters the most comprehensive of the Pauline Epistles—unites most intimately the character of a dogmatic epistle of instruction with the character of an ecclesiastical address in a specific, personal relation. Proceeding from the standpoint of his apostleship to the Gentiles, and after a satisfactory conclusion of his apostolic labors in the East, the Apostle designs to prepare the Christian church in Rome to

be the centre and starting-point of labors reaching to the farthest West (Spain). His work in the West should be universal, not merely as it united the West and East in Christ, but also as it constituted in Rome the peculiar type for the united church of Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians. The Apostle to the heathen is, in his consciousness, perfectly ripened into the apostle for the nations; and in this sense he intends to clothe the church at Rome with the prestige of a church of the nations, which he might regard as of his own institution, and make use of as the home of his universal activity.

To this purpose, the change of the Roman church from uncertain authority into a fixed institution of Pauline authority, corresponds the universal soteriological doctrine of the Epistle, as related to the universal ecclesiastical call of Paul. All men, viewed under the antagonism of Jews and heathen, are, in consequence of the prostitution of the living Divine glory, regarded as sinners, destitute of righteousness and merit before God; and all men have a common mercy-seat for pardon in Christ; all should pass from the old life of death in sin, or in the flesh and under the law, to the new life in Christ, in the spirit and in liberty; all were included under the judgment of unbelief, and all should experience Divine compassion. On this dogmatic foundation the church at Rome should be completely based; and in accordance therewith, it should regulate its internal relation between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians, as well as its external relation to the world; but it must also, in accordance with this principle, perceive that its call as the central city of the Western Church can only be actualized by first acknowledging the call of Paul, and committing itself to him, as a point of departure in his universal work.

This Epistle has a unique character in relation to the Apostle, since he wrote it to a church which he had not established, and had not even once visited. But the anomalous character of this fact may be thus explained: The church was, on one hand, still perfectly vacant from all apostolical authority, and it was thus far not yet fully organized as a church; and, on the other hand, it was not only naturally related to the Apostle to the Gentiles as the church of the world's metropolis, but had been long previously visited by him in spirit, and was accordingly taken possession of by his pupils and assistants as his sphere of labor (see chap. xvi.). The case was similar with the Epistle to the Colossians, though the Apostle may be regarded as the indirect founder of this church (by Epaphras).

In its dogmatic aspect, the Epistle to the Romans possesses a decidedly *soteriological* character. As to its form, it resembles, in its cautious tone, the Epistle to the Galatians; for the Apostle probes the former church, and asks whether it be *already* his church? and of the latter, he asks whether it *still* be his church? (Rom. xv. 15, 16; Gal. iv. 19, 20).

[The Epistle to the Romans, and that to the Galatians, treat of the same theme, viz., justification by free grace through faith in Christ, or rather, the deeper and broader doctrine of a personal life-union of the believer with Christ; but the latter is apologetic and polemic against the Judaizing pseudo-apostles, who labored to undermine Paul's authority, and to enforce the yoke of legalism upon a church of his own planting; while the former, written to strangers, opposes no particular class of men, but only the corrupt tendencies of the human heart. Both supplement each other, and constitute the grand charter of evangelical freedom in Christ.—P. S.]

The Epistle to the Romans has this in common with the Epistle to the Ephesians, that it shows how salvation in Christ transforms Gentiles and Jews into one Church of God; but in the Epistle to the Ephesians he establishes this unity on the christological principle, while in the Epistle to the Romans, it is effected by the soteriology. The relation of the Romans to the Colossians is similar to the one just described. [But with this difference, that the christological element prevails in the Epistle to the Colossians, the ecclesiological in that to the Ephesians.—P. S.]

In its ecclesiastical and practical character the Epistle to the Romans resembles those to the Corinthians. But in the former case the Apostle has yet to establish an authority and institution, while in the latter he has to maintain them.

In the section from chap. ix. to xi., this Epistle approaches the eschatological contents of

the Epistles to the Thessalonians. The greetings in chap. xvi. remind us of the Epistle to the Philippians; the practical portion reminds us of the Pastoral Epistles.

In this Epistle the idea of piety or of righteousness, as a living worship of God, is peculiarly prominent; perhaps produced by the decided predominance of the practical element in the Roman conception of cultus. The fall of man commenced with the great *peccatum omissionis*: Men, regardless of the natural revelation of God, forsook the living worship and praise of God chap. i. 21). Therefore the development of corruption among the heathen is shown in an xternal symbolism, which more and more sinks into a mythical idolatry, and results in a growing perversion and decay of morals (chap. i. 22–32); but among the Jews, in the fearful caricature into which even its religious zeal is turned by its fleshly fanaticism (chap. ii. 17–24). Therefore is salvation for faith represented by the mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies (chap. iii. 25), and faith is a priestly free access to grace (chap. v. 2), which converts the whole subsequent life of the Christian into a song of praise (vers. 3–11). Therefore the crown of the new life is a revelation of the glory of the children of God, which is guaranteed by the spirit of prayer on the part of the faithful (chap. viii.). Therefore, finally, must the economically limited judgment of God on Israel, and the whole economy of salvation in reference to the dark history of the world, contribute to the glory of God (chap. xi. 36). The new life is consequently represented as the direct contrast to the fall of man. As the living service of God ceased with the latter, so now is the true spiritual service of God restored in the lives of Christians, since they dedicate their bodies as living sacrifices to God (chap. xii. 1 ff.). The temporal authority (chap. xiii. 1 ff.) stands in a subservient (ver. 4) and liturgical (ver. 6) relation to the living divine service of Christians. In its great moral significance, which also requires a moral and free recognition (ver. 5), it is unconsciously subject to the highest aim and goal of human history—the glory of God through Christ. The Church must be conformed to this glory; it must be an instrument for the object that all nations should praise God (chap. xv. 11). The Epistle is directed to this end: it is a priestly work to make the heathen an acceptable offering of God (chap. xv. 16). It finally corresponds to this conception of the kingdom of God as a restored and real worship, that the Apostle concludes with a liturgical doxology, in which faith in the promises and announcements of the gospel responds to the living God of revelation with an eternal Amen (chap. xvi. 25–27)—a passage which may be explained by a comparison with 1 Cor. xiv. 16; 2 Cor. i. 20; Heb. xii. 22; xiii. 15; Rev. iv. 10.

The church at Rome must, therefore, in accordance with its call, become a focus for the restoration of the living, real, and universal worship of God by the nations, as the institution of Paul, the universal Apostle of the nations. It must become the point of departure of the Church of the Western nations, in the sense in which the word *catholic* had been originally used; that is, in harmony with the religious and moral necessities of humanity, in harmony with the moral significance and mission of the state, in harmony with the free as well as with the anxious consciences of the faithful on the basis of justification by faith without the works of the law.

B. *The Arrangement.*

THE INTRODUCTION AND FUNDAMENTAL THEME.

The apostolate of Paul appointed for the glory of the name of God by means of the gospel of Christ, and of the revelation of the justice of God for faith throughout the whole world, among Jews and Gentiles, chap. i. 1–17.

1st Section.—The inscription and greeting. The Apostle; his call; his apostolic office; his greeting of the saints in Rome, vers. 1–7.

2d Section.—The point of connection. The fame of the faith of the Christians at Rome in all the world; and his desire and purpose to come to them to announce the gospel to them vers. 8–15.

3d Section.—The fundamental theme. The joyful readiness of the Apostle to proclaim the gospel of Christ, since it is the power of God to save Jews and Gentiles—as a revelation of the righteousness of God by and for faith, vers. 16, 17.

Part First.

The doctrine of righteousness by faith, as the restoration of the true worship of God chap. i 18-chap. xi.

FIRST DIVISION.

Sin and grace in their first antagonism. The real appearance of corruption and salvation Righteousness by faith. The wrath of God on all injustice of men; that is, the actual corruption of the world in its growth for death hastened by the judgment of God; and the antagonistic justification of sinners by the propitiation or pardon in Christ, through faith chap. i. 18–v. 11.

1st Section.—The beginning of all real corruption in the world, and of the Gentiles in particular, and God's judgment on the same; the neglect of the general revelation of God by the creation, in the omission of the real worship of God by praise and thanksgiving, chap. i. 18–21.

2d Section.—The development of heathen corruption under the judicial abandonment on God's side (the withdrawal of His Spirit). From symbolism to the worship of images and beasts; from theoretical to practical corruption; from natural sins to unnatural and abominable ones, to the development of all vices and crimes, to the demoniacal lust for sin, and to evil maxims themselves, chap. i. 22–32.

3d Section.—Transition from the corruption of the Gentiles to the corruption of the Jews. *The genuine Jews. The higher universal antagonism above the antagonism of heathendom and Judaism: striving and opposing men.* The universality of corruption, and, with the universality of guilt, the worst corruption: judging the neighbor. The guilt of this uncharitable judgment is intensified by the continuance of a general antagonism of pious, striving men, and of stiff-necked enemies of the truth throughout the world, within the general corruption, over against the righteous and impartial government of God; this, too, by virtue of the continuance of God's general legislation in the conscience. The revelation of the antagonism of Gentiles true to the law, and of Jews who despised the law on the day *of the proclamation of the gospel*, chap. ii. 1–16.

4th Section.—*The real Jews.* The increased corruption of the Jew in his false zeal for the law (a counterpart of the corruption of the heathen in his symbolism). The fanatical and wicked method of the Jews in handling the law with legal pride, and of corrupting it by false application and unfaithfulness, an occasion for defaming the name of God among the heathen, chap. ii. 17–24.

5th Section.—The use of circumcision: an adjustment of the need of salvation by the knowledge of sin. The circumcision which becomes the foreskin, and the foreskin which becomes circumcision; or, the external Jew can possibly become an internal Gentile, while the external Gentile can become an internal Jew. It is not the dead possession of the law, but fidelity to the law, that is of use. It does not produce a pride of the law, but knowledge of sin—that is, of the necessity of salvation. The advantage of circumcision consists herein: that to the Jews are committed those declarations of God, that law, by which all men are represented under the penalty of sin. Sin represented as acknowledged guilt over against the law, chap. ii. 25–iii. 20.

6th Section.—The revelation of God's righteousness without the law by faith in Christ, for all sinners without distinction, by the representation of Christ as the Mediator (Propitiator)· the righteousness of God as justifying righteousness, chap. iii. 21–26.

7th Section.—The abrogation of the vain glory (or self-praise) of man by the law of faith

Justification by faith *without the works of the law.* First proof from experience: God is the God of the heathen as well as of the Jews; which fact is shown by the faith of the Gentiles, as well as by the true renewal of the law by faith, vers. 27–31.

8th Section.—Second proof of the righteousness by faith: from the Scriptures, and this from the history of the faith of Abraham, the ancestor of the Jews themselves. Abraham is the father of faith to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews, because he had been justified in the foreskin as a heathen, and because he had received circumcision as a seal of justification by faith. David is also a witness of righteousness by faith. Abraham in his faith in the word of the personal God of revelation, and especially in the promise of Isaac, a type of all believers in the miracle of the resurrection of Christ, chap. iv.

9th Section.—The fruit of justification. Peace with God and the development of new life to the fulfilment of Christian hope. The new worship of God by the Christians. They have free access to grace in the Most Holy. Therefore they boast of their hope in the glory of God; and glory even in the afflictions they suffer, by which this hope is perfected. The love of God in Christ as the guaranty of the realization of Christian hope. Christ's death our reconciliation: Christ's life our blessedness. Its bloom: the joyous glorying that God is *our God*, chap v. 1–11.

SECOND DIVISION.

Sin and grace in their second antagonism (as in their second power), according to their operations in human nature and in nature generally. The sinful corruption of the world proceeding from Adam and made the common inheritance of man; and the life of Christ as the internal vital principle of the new birth for new life in single believers, in all humanity, and in the whole created world. The principle of death in sin, and the principle of the new life; as well as the glorification of all nature in righteousness, chap. v. 12–viii. 39.

1st Section.—The sin of Adam as the mighty principle of death, and the grace of God in Christ as the mightier principle of the new life in individual human nature, and in whole humanity. The law as the medium of the completed consciousness of sin and guilt, chap. v. 12–21.

2d Section.—Call to the new life in grace. The contradiction between sin and grace. The vocation of the Christians to new life, since they, by baptism in the death of Christ, are changed from the sphere of sin and death into the sphere of righteousness and life, chap. vi. 1–11.

3d Section.—The essential emancipation and actual departure of Christians from the service of sin unto death into the service of righteousness unto life, by virtue of the death of Christ. Believers should live in the consciousness that they are dead to sin, vers. 12–23.

4th Section.—The essential transfer and actual transition of Christians from the service of the letter under the law to the service of the Spirit under grace, by virtue of the death of Christ. Believers should live in the consciousness that they (by the law) are dead to the law, chap. vii. 1–6.

5th Section.—The law in its holy appointment to lead over, by the feeling of death, to new life in grace. The development of the law from the exterior to the internal. The experience of Paul a life-picture of the battle under the law as the transition from the old life in the law to the new life in faith, vers. 7–25.

6th Section.—The Christian life, or life in Christ as the new life according to the law of the Spirit, as walking in the Spirit. The fulfilment and exaltation of the law to be the law of the Spirit in Christ. The law of the Spirit as principle of the new life of adoption, and of the exaltation of the faithful and of humanity to the liberation and glorification of the creature, to the new world of life in love, chap. viii.

a. The Spirit as the Mediator of the atonement and witness of adoption, vers. 1–16.

b. The Spirit a surety of the inheritance of future glory. (1.) The subjective certainty

of future perfection, or the spiritualization and glorification of Christian life, vers 17–27. (2.) The objective certainty of future perfection in glory, vers. 28–39.

THIRD DIVISION.

Sin and grace in their third antagonism (in their third power). The hardness of heart and the economical judgment on hardness of heart (the historical curse on sin), and the turning of the judgment to the rescue by the power of Divine sympathy at the progress of universal history. The historical development of sin to the execution of the judgment, and the revelation of salvation in demonstration of mercy. The intimate connection of God's acts of judgment and rescue; the latter being conditioned by the former, chaps. ix.–xi.

1st Section.—The dark mystery of the judgment of God in Israel, and its solution, chap. ix.

a. The painful contrast of the misery of the Jews in opposition to the portrayed happiness of the Christians, who, for the most part, came from the Gentiles. The sorrow of the Apostle at the evident failure of the destiny of his people, chap. ix. 1–5.

b. The ecstasy of the Apostle in the thought that the promise of God would nevertheless hold good for Israel. The proofs therefor, chap. ix. 6–33.

2d Section.—More decided explanation of the mysterious fact: The unbelief of Israel. The faith of the Gentiles, already foretold in the Old Testament, chap. x.

a. The fact is no fatalistic destiny, vers. 1, 2.

b. It rests rather on the antagonism between the self-righteousness as the supposed righteousness from the law, and the righteousness which is by faith, vers. 3–5.

c. The righteousness by faith, although proceeding from Israel, is nevertheless, according to Old Testament prophecy, accessible to all men because of its nature. Proof: The unbelief of the Jews as well as the faith of the heathen is foretold already in the Old Testament, vers. 6–21.

3d Section.—The concluding gracious solution of the mystery, or the turning of judgment to the rescue of Israel. The judgment of God on Israel is not a judgment of reprobation. God's economy of salvation in His Providence over the chosen of Israel and of the multitude—Jews and Gentiles—over the intertwining of judgment and rescue, by which all Israel should come, through the fulness of the Gentiles, to faith and happiness. The universality of judgment and compassion. Doxology, chap. xi.

a. Israel is not rejected; the elect (the kernel) are saved, vers. 1–6.

b. The hardening of the hearts of the remainder becomes a condition for the conversion of the Gentiles, vers. 7–11.

c. On the other hand, the conversion of the Gentiles became also a means for the conversion of Israel, vers. 11–18.

d. The fact itself is a conditional one. The Gentiles can yet individually become unbelieving, and the Jews, on the other hand, believing, vers. 19–24.

e. The last word, or the mystery of Divine Providence in its economy of salvation. All will contribute to the glory of God, vers. 25–36.

Part Second.

The practical theme: The vocation of the Roman Christians, on the ground of their accomplished salvation or of the mercy of God (which will be extended to all) to represent the living worship of God in the consummation of the real burnt offering, and to constitute a universal Christian church-life for the realization of the call of all nations to praise and glorify God; so that they may also acknowledge and maintain the universal call of the Apostle. The recommendation of his companions, assistants, and friends, in the sending of his greetings to them for the purpose of the true development of the Church, and as a com

terpart, his warning against Judaizing or paganizing errorists. Greetings, invocation of blessings, chap. xii. 1–xvi. 27.

FIRST DIVISION.

The call of the Roman Christians to a universal Christian deportment, chap. xii. 1–xv. 13.

1st Section.—The practical theme, vers. 1, 2. The proper conduct of the Christians toward the community of the brethren for the establishment of a harmonious church life, chap. xii. 1–8.

2d Section.—The true conduct of the Christians in all personal relations. For their own life, toward the brethren, toward everybody, and even toward enemies, chap. xii. 9–21.

3d Section.—Christian universalism (Roman Catholicism in Paul's sense) in the proper conduct toward those in authority (the heathen state), which also possesses an official and liturgical service in the household of God. The object and aim of government, chap. xiii. 1–6.

4th Section.—Proper conduct toward the world in general. Legal fellowship with the world. The recognition of the rights of the world in the justice and also in the strength of the love of our neighbor. The separation from the ungodly nature of the old world (the dark character of heathendom). The universality and its sanctification by the true separation, vers. 7–14.

5th Section.—The true practice of the living worship of God in the management and adjustment of the differences between the weak or perplexed (the slaves of the law) and the strong (inclined to disregard, and Antinomian transgression in freedom). The Christian universality of social life (to *take* and *give* no offence), chap. xiv. 1–xv. 4.

a. Reciprocal regard, forbearance, and recognition between the weak and the strong. Special warning against giving offence to the weak, chap. xiv. 1–13.

b. Of giving offence, and despising forbearance to the weak, chap. xiv. 13–xvi.

c. Reciprocal edification in self-denial after the example of Christ, chap. xv. 2–4.

6th Section.—Admonition to the harmony of all the members of the congregation to the praise of God on the ground of the grace of God, in which Christ has accepted Jews and Gentiles. Reference to the vocation of all nations to praise God even according to the Old Testament, and encouragement of the Roman Christians to an unbounded hope in this relation, in agreement with their call, chap. xv. 5–13.

SECOND DIVISION.

The call of the Apostle to a universal apostleship, and his consequent relation to the Roman church, as the point of departure for the universal apostleship in the West, chap. xv. 14–33.

a. The Apostle declares, almost apologizingly, that his writing to the Romans was the result of his call to make the heathen in priestly operation an acceptable offering to God; and he gives information on the general completion of his work in the East (to Illyria), and the results of the same, vers. 14–19.

b. His principle not to invade the sphere of others (a conduct opposite to that of all sect-makers). The consequent impediment to come directly to Rome, where Christian congregations already existed. Nevertheless, his desire to labor for them, which was in harmony with his call. His hesitation not being completely removed, he describes his anticipated visit to Rome as a temporary stay for the better prosecution of his journey through Rome to Spain; that is, to the limits of the West, without doubt in expectation that the church will welcome him and commit itself to his direction, vers. 20–24.

c. His last hindrance from his journey to Rome. The mention of the collections, a proof of his love to the believing Israelites, an expression of the proper conduct of Gentile Christians to Jewish Christians. Another announcement of his journey

through Rome and of his visit in the spirit of apostolical refinement. *Foreboding* reference to the animosity of the unfaithful in Judæa, and a request for prayer that he might be permitted to accomplish his purpose of coming to them, vers. 23–33.

THIRD DIVISION.

The recommendation of his predecessors, companions, and assistants, in a succession of greetings, united with a warning against separatistic heretics (Jews and Gentiles), who could hinder and even destroy Rome's destiny and his apostolic mission. *Yet the God of peace will shortly bruise Satan under their feet.* Invocation of blessing, chap. xvi. 1–20.

a. The deaconess Phœbe, vers. 1, 2.

b. The greetings, vers. 3–16. The warning, and the invocation of blessing, vers. 17–20.

CONCLUSION.

The greetings of the Pauline circle to the church at Rome, and the invocation of blessings by Paul himself. His doxological sealing of the gospel of the justifying grace of God in Christ for all nations, vers. 21–27.

a. The greetings.

b. The doxological sealing of the gospel for eternity in accordance with the fundamental devotional thought of his Epistle. The Amen of the Church through Christ, as the response to the gospel of Christ, vers. 25–27.

Now to Him that is of power (in the gospel) to stablish you
According to my gospel, etc.
According to the revelation of the mystery, etc.
According to the commandment of the everlasting God.
To God only wise,
Be glory through Jesus Christ
For ever! Amen!

APPENDIX.—Table of Pericopes, or Scripture Lessons for the Year, in the Epistle to the Romans.

1. Advent	Rom. xiii. 11–14.
2. "	Rom. xv. 4–13.
1st Sunday after Epiphany	Rom. xii. 1–6.
2d " " "	Rom. xii. 7–16.
3d " " "	Rom. xii. 17–21.
4th " " "	Rom. xiii. 8–10.
Trinity	Rom. xi. 33–36.
4th Sunday after Trinity	Rom. viii. 18–23.
(Visitation of Mary.)	Rom. xii. 9–16.
6th Sunday after Trinity	Rom. vi. 3–11.
7th " " "	Rom. vi. 19–23.
8th " " "	Rom. viii. 12–17.
27th " " "	Rom. iii. 21–25.

§ 8. LITERATURE ON THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.*

See the foregoing catalogues of Pauline literature in general. Also the catalogues in Lilienthal's *Bibl. Archivarius*, p. 247 ff., where there is a rich catalogue of the older works on single passages of the Epistle; Fuhrmann's *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, ii. p. 326; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, vol. i. p. 255 ff.; ii. p. 121; Supplement, p. 39; Danz, in his *Universalwörterbuch der theol. Literatur*, p. 846, and in the supplementary number, p. 95, who gives an extensive catalogue of literature, not only to the entire Epistle, but on single divisions and chapters; Guericke, *Neu-testamentliche Isagogik* [3d ed., 1868, pp. 276 and 309]; Reuss [*History of the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament*, 4th ed., 1864, p. 98]. Reiche [*Commentary on the Romans*, 1833, vol. i.] p. 95 ff. [Comp. the catalogue of English works on all the Epistles, and on the separate portions of the same, in Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica* (subject: Holy Scriptures), London, 1859.]

* [In the original, this section is § 7, and precedes the one on the Contents and Division.—P. S.]

COMMENTARIES.—THOLUCK enumerates, p. 26 ff., as expositors: *

1. Among the Church fathers: ORIGEN [†251, only in the mutilated Latin version of RUFINUS, ORIG. *Opera*, ed. Delarue, tom. iv.—P. S.], CHRYSOSTOM [†405, *Homil. xxxii. in ep. ad Rom. Opera*, ed. Bened. tom. ix., an English translation in the *Oxford Library of the Fathers*, vols. vii., 1841], THEODORET [†457, *Comment. in ep. ad Rom.*], THEODORE OF MOPSVESTIA [†429, Fragments, collected by FRIED. FRITZSCHE, in *Theod. Mops. in N. T. Comm.*, 1847], THEOPHYLACT [eleventh century], ŒKUMENIUS [tenth century], Greek scholiast of the *Moskow Codd. in Matthæi* [and in J. A. CRAMER'S *Catenæ in S. Pauli ep. ad Rom.*, Oxon. 1844]. Among the Latin fathers: AUGUSTINE [†430],† PELAGIUS,‡ HILARIUS (the AMBROSIASTER).§

2. Expositors of the Middle Ages: HERVEUS [middle of the twelfth century], HUGO OF ST. VICTOR [†1141], ABÆLARD [†1142], THOMAS AQUINAS [†1274, ignorant of Greek, but very profound and acute].

3. Roman Catholic expositors since the Reformation: ERASMUS [†1536], W. ESTE [†1613], a number of Jesuit expositors, among whom BEN. JUSTINIAN [1612], CORNELIUS A LAPIDE [1614, 14th ed., Lugd. 1683], CALMET [†1757], are prominent. For later ones, see below.

4. Protestant expositors down to the beginning of the seventeenth century:

a. REFORMED (Calvinistic) commentators: CALVIN [new ed., Halle, 1831], "a model of simple and precise exposition" (German translation by E. W. KRUMMACHER and L. BENDER, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1837),‖ BEZA [4th ed., 1598], ZWINGLI [*Opera*, tom. iii.], PELLICANUS, BULLINGER [1537], BUCER [1536], ARETIUS [1603], PAREUS [1608], PISCATOR [1601].

b. Lutherans: LUTHER (his celebrated *Preface* to the Epistle to the Romans), MELANCHTHON (*Annotationes*, 1522; *Commentarii*, 1532),¶ BUGENHAGEN, BRENZ, CAMERARIUS, HUNNIUS, BALDUIN.

5. Protestant expositors to the middle of the eighteenth century:

Reformed: DRUSIUS [†1612], DE DIEU [†1642], HEINSIUS [†1655], the two CAPELLUS, HAMMOND [1653], CLERICUS [1698], COCCEIUS [†1669], (very prominent).

* [The dates and editions are added by the American editor.]

† [ST. AUGUSTINE has only commented on the first seven verses of the Epistle to the Romans, in his *Inchoata expositio ep. ad Rom. Opera*, ed. Bened., tom. iii. p. 926 sqq., and on some select passages, in *expos. quarundam propositionum ex ep. ad Rom.*, *l. c.*, p. 903 sqq. It is a remarkable fact that AUGUSTINE, who, of all the fathers, came nearest the Protestant evangelical doctrines of sin and grace as taught by St. Paul, held essentially the Roman Catholic view of justification as being identical with sanctification, while his antagonist, PELAGIUS, like the Reformers, explained Paul's justification as a *forensic* act that consists in the remission of sins. Comp. my *History of the Christian Church*, vol. iii. p. 812, 845. In his anti-Pelagian writings, AUGUSTINE makes frequent use of the Epistle to the Romans, and the other Pauline Epistles, which contributed much to his conversion. But he was a profound theologian rather than a learned commentator, and had a very imperfect knowledge of the Greek, and no knowledge whatever of the Hebrew. Upon the whole, the Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians in their true genius and import remained a sealed book to the Church at large till the Reformation of the sixteenth century. The sense of the Scriptures unfolds itself gradually to the mind of the Church, and every book has its age in which its peculiar power is felt in the life, and brought out in the knowledge and exposition of congenial divines more clearly and forcibly than ever before.—P. S.]

‡ [The commentary of the heretical PELAGIUS on the Pauline Epistles is brief and superficial, but betrays no mean talent for plain, popular, and practical common-sense exposition of the Scriptures. By a singular irony of history, the commentaries, together with some other writings of PELAGIUS in which he develops his heretical system (the *Epistola ad Demetriadem*, and his *libellus fidei* addressed to Pope Innocent I.), have been preserved as supposed works of his bitter antagonist, ST. JEROME (in the eleventh tome of Vallarsi's edition; comp. my *Church Hist.*, iii. p. 791 and p. 965). The commentaries, however, have undergone some emendations by the hand of Cassiodorus (comp. CASS., *De institut. divin. liter.*, c. 8).—P. S.]

§ [The commentary of AMBROSIASTER, so called, or PSEUDO-AMBROSIUS, on the Pauline Epistles, is incorporated in the works of AMBROSE, and is generally ascribed to a Roman deacon, HILARY, of the fourth century (about 380). Augustine refers to it twice under this name, *Contra duas Epp. Pelag.* iv. 7, *Opera*, x. p. 472. AMBROSIASTER exhibits some talent for historical exposition (like PELAGIUS), but is obscure and inconsistent. Upon the whole the patristic exegesis was not grammatical and historical, but dogmatical and practical.—P. S.]

‖ [English translation of CALVIN on the Romans, by CHRISTOPHER ROSDELL, F. SIBSON, and JOHN OWEN. Edinb. Calvin Transl. Soc., 1844 and 1849.—P. S.]

¶ [MEYER (Preface to the 4th ed. of his Com.) calls MELANCHTHON'S "*Enarratio*" of 1556, "his ripest exegetical fruit." The "*Commentarii*" of MELANCHTHON appeared also in 1540, and in a new edition by NICKEL in 1861. LANGE following THOLUCK, refers to older editions.—P. S.]

Lutherans of the seventeenth century: ERASMUS SCHMID [†1637], CALIXTUS [Posthumous Lectures, 1664], CALOVIUS [†1688, author of the *Biblia Illustrata*, 1672, against GROTIUS] SPENER [†1705], CHRIST. WOLF [*Curæ Phililogicæ et Criticæ*, 1732], BENGEL'S *Gnomon N. T.* (1742); "on account of its great worth, lately edited several times, both in the original Latin, and in German and English translations.")*

Arminians: GROTIUS [*Annotationes in Nov. Test.*, 1645], LIMBORCH [†1712], TURRETINE [†1737], (numbered by THOLUCK in this school, though perhaps unjustly), WETSTEIN (in his edition of the Greek Testament, with parallel passagess from the classical authors, 1751).

Socinians: CRELL [†1633], SCHLICHTING [†1661], PRZIPZOV.

6. Evangelical expositors, from the middle of the eighteenth century down to the present time:

Period of transition: HEUMANN [†1764], MOSHEIM [†1770], JOH. BENJ. CARPZOV ("the fourth of this name," 1758), MORUS [†1794], CHRISTIAN SCHMID [†1774]; above all, SEMLER [1791]. KOPPE [3d ed., 1824] also belongs here.

Latest period: THOLUCK (1st ed., 1824),† FLATT [1825], STENERSEN (Danish, 1829), KLEE [Roman Catholic, 1830], BENECKE [1831], RÜCKERT [2d ed., 1839], PAULUS, MOSES STUART [Andover, Mass., 1832], CHARLES HODGE [Princeton, New Jersey, 1835], REICHE [1834], KÖLLNER [1834], GLÖCKLER [1834], OLSHAUSEN [2d ed., 1840, English translation, Edinburgh and New York, 1860], DE WETTE [4th ed., 1847], STENGEL [Roman Catholic, 1836], FRITZSCHE [3 vols., in Latin, 1836–'43, very thorough and critical], H. A. W. MEYER,‡ OLTRAMARE (French), NIELSEN (Danish, in German by MICHELSEN), [1843], BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS [1844], REITHMAYER [Roman Catholic, Regensb., 1845], A. L. G. KREHL [Leipzig, 1849], ADALB. MAIER (Roman Catholic), PHILIPPI [a strict Lutheran, 1848, 2d ed., revised, 1856; 3d ed., 1867].

On the merits of the most important later commentators, see THOLUCK, pp. 32, 33.—[FRITZSCHE and MEYER are the best philological commentators; DE WETTE excels in power of condensation and good taste; THOLUCK, OLSHAUSEN, PHILIPPI, and HODGE in doctrinal exposition.—P. S.]

This catalogue may be enlarged, among others, by the following commentaries: BISPING (Rom. Cath.), *Der Brief an die Römer*, 2d ed., Münster; BEELEN (Rom. Cath.), *Commentarius in Ep. St. Pauli ad Romanos*, Lovani, 1854; VINKE, *De Brief van den Apostel Paulus an den Romainen*, 2d ed., Utrecht, 1860; MEHRING, *Der Brief Pauli an die Römer*, Stettin, 1859; SCHOTT, *Der Römerbrief, seinem Endzweck und Gedankengang nach ausgelegt*, Erlangen, 1858; VAN HENGEL, *Interpretatio Epistolæ Pauli ad Romanos*, Leyden und Leipzig, 1 vol. 1854; 2d vol., 1859; HALDANE, *Auslegung des Briefes an die Römer, mit Bemerkungen über die Commentare Macknight's, Stuart's, und Tholuck's*, from the English, Hamburg, 1839–'43; UMBREIT, *Der Brief an die Römer, auf dem Grunde des Alten Testaments ausgelegt*, Gotha, 1856. [H. EWALD, *Die Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus übers. und erkl.*, Gött. 1857.—P. S.]

THEOLOGICAL-EXEGETICAL MONOGRAPHS ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.—See REUSS, p. 95; JÄGER, *Der Lehrgehalt des Römerbriefs*, Tüb. 1834; WINZER, *Adnotatt. ad loca quædam Epist. P. ad Rom.*, Leipzig, 1835; E. G. BENGEL, *Rom.* ii. 11–16, Tüb.; MICHELSEN, *De Pauli ad Rom. Ep. duobus primis capitibus*, Lübeck, 1835; MATTHIAS, *The Third Chapter of*

* [THOLUCK (p. 31) says of BENGEL'S *Gnomon*, that it was prepared with the devotion of an enthusiastic lover, whose searching eye noticed and admired even the most unseemly feature of the beloved, and carried out with a precision which weighed even the smallest particle.—P. S.]

† [The first edition of THOLUCK'S Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, which appeared in 1824, when the author was but twenty-five years of age, created quite an epoch in the exegetical literature of Germany, by breaking the way for a return to a reverent treatment of the New Testament as the revealed word of God, and by reopening the exegetical treasures of the fathers and reformers. In the subsequent editions it has been repeatedly rewritten and gained in ripe scholarship. The last edition is the fifth, Halle, 1856. Between the first and the fifth edition, about forty commentaries on the same Epistle have made their appearance. An English translation of THOLUCK by the Rev. ROBERT MENZIES was published in London, 1842, 2 vols.; but this is superseded by the later editions of the original.—P. S.]

‡ [Fourth edition, 1865, improved and enlarged (by thirty pages). Dr. LANGE has used the third, which appeared in 1859. The American editor has throughout compared the last edition of this important work.—P. S.]

Romans, Cassel, 1857; SEYLER, *Dissert. Exeg. in Ep. P. ad Rom.*, c. *IV.*, Halle, 1824; GREEB on Chap. V. 1–11, Amsterd., 1855; R. ROTHE, *Neuer Versuch einer Auslegung der paulinischen Stelle, Röm. V.* 12–21, Wittenberg, 1836; MANGOLD, *Exeget. Versuch über Röm. V.* 11–21, Erfurt, 1841; KÄUFFER, *Examinatur novissima Bretschneideri de loco Rom. V.* 12 *sententia*, Dresden 1834; HUGENHOLTZ, *Disp. de Cap. VI. Ep. P. ad Rom.*, Utrecht, 1821; KOHLBRÜGGE, *Das siebente Kap.*, etc., Leyden, 1840; FISCHER, *Ad loc. Rom. VIII.* 18–34, Wittenberg, 1806; GRIMM, *De vocabulo κτίσις Rom. VIII.* 19 *commentatio*, Leipzig, 1812; REICHE, *De natura gemebunda, Rom. VIII.* 19, Göttingen, 1830–'32; GADOLIN, *Rom. VIII.* 28–30, Helsingfors, 1834; BECK, *Versuch einer pneumatisch-hermeneutischen Entwickelung des IX. Kap.*, Stuttgart, 1839; RANFFT, *Deutliche Erklärung des IX.–XI. Kap. der Epistel Pauli an die Römer*, Leipzig, 1750; E. KRUMMACHER, *Das Dogma von der Gnadenwahl* (*nebst Auslegung des IX.–XI. Kap.*), Duisburg, 1856; on the same chapters, STEUDEL, in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift*, 1836, i.; BAUR, in the same, iii.; HAUSSERT, in PELT's *Mitarbeiten*, 1838, iii.; MEYER, in the same; HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, i. p. 212 [in the 2d edition, vol. i. p. 238 ff.—P. S.]; BORGER, *De parte Epist. ad Romanos paranetica*, Leyden, 1840; PHIL. SCHAFF, *Das neunte Kapitel des Römerbriefs übersetzt und erklärt*, Mercersburg, 1852 (in SCHAFF's *Kirchenfreund*, vol. v. p. 378 ff., and p. 414 ff.); WANGEMANN, *Der Brief an die Römer nach Wortlaut und Gedankengang*, Berlin, 1866; [W. MANGOLD, *Der Römerbrief, und die Anfänge der Römischen Gemeinde*, Marburg, 1866. A valuable critical essay. For a very large number of English essays and sermons on special chapters and verses of the Epistle to the Romans, see JAMES DARLING's *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, Lond. 1859, pp. 1263–1313.—P. S.]

PRACTICAL COMMENTARIES AND HOMILETICAL LITERATURE.*—Among these we mention the works on the Romans by ANTON (1746), SPENER (new ed., by SCHOTT, 1839), STORR (1823), KRAUSSOLD (1830), GEISSLER (1831), LOSSIUS (1836), KOHLBRÜGGE (1839), ROOS (new ed., 1860), WINKEL (1850), DIEDRICH (1856), BESSER (*Bibelstunden*, vol. vii., 1861); the *Bible-Works* of GERLACH, LISCO, CALW., and BUNSEN (vol. viii., 1863); HEUBNER's *Practical Exposition of the N. T.*; ORTLOPH, *Epistle to the Romans*, Erlangen, 1865–'66.

[This list of commentaries on the Romans, by Drs. THOLUCK and LANGE, is almost exclusively Continental, and must be supplied by Anglo-American works, of which only three are mentioned by Dr. THOLUCK—the commentaries of HAMMOND, STUART, and HODGE. Comp. DARLING's *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, London, 1859, p. 1236 ff. We notice the most important:

I. General English commentaries on the *whole Bible:* MATTHEW POOLE (*Synopsis Criticorum*, etc., 4 vols. in 5 fol., Lond. 1669–'76, and Francof. ad M. 1712, 5 vols. f.; *Annotations upon the Holy Bible*, 4th ed., 1700, new ed., Lond. 1840, reprinted by R. CARTER in N. Y.); PATRICK, LOWTH, ARNOLD, WHITBY, and LOWMAN (*Critical Commentary and Paraphrase on the Old and New Testaments, and the Apocrypha*, a new ed., Philad. 1844, in 4 vols.); M. HENRY (in many editions of 3, 4, and 6 vols., the most original, interesting, and edifying among the popular and practical commentators); JOHN GILL (first ed., Lond. 1763, in 9 vols., full of rabbinical learning and ultra-Calvinism); THOS. SCOTT (several editions, in 6 vols. or less); A. CLARKE (new ed., Lond. 1844, in 6 vols.); D'OYLY and R. MANT (Lond. 1845; gives the comments of the Anglican bishops and divines); *Comprehensive Commentary* (compiled from HENRY and SCOTT, and other sources, by W. JENKS, Philad. 1855, in 5 vols.).

II. Commentaries on the *New Testament*, including the Epistle to the Romans: H. HAMMOND (4th ed., Lond. 1675); D. WHITBY (4th ed., Lond. 1718, and often since); W. BURKITT (Lond. 1704, and often since; very good for practical and homiletical use); P. DODDRIDGE (*Family Expositor*, Lond. 1739, in 7 vols., and often); ALBERT BARNES (*Notes Explanatory and Practical*, New York and Lond. 1850, and often, 11 vols., prepared for Sunday-school teachers, and circulated in many thousands of copies); S. T. BLOOMFIELD (*The Greek Testament, with Notes Critical, Philological, and Exegetical*, first published in 1829, 9th ed., Lond

* [We have omitted or abridged the German titles of these books.—P. S.

1855); H. Alford (*Greek Testament*, with a critically revised text, a digest of various readings, marginal references to verbal and idiomatic usage, prolegomena, and a critical and exegetical commentary; first published in 1849, 5th ed., Lond. 1865, in 4 vols.; in the 5th edition, the Codex Sinaiticus has been collated. Dean Alford follows in the track of Tischendorf as to the text, and De Wette and Meyer in the exposition, yet with independent judgment, good taste, and reverent spirit); Webster and Wilkinson (*N. Test. Gr.*, with brief grammatical and exegetical Notes, Oxon., 1851, in 2 vols.); Chr. Wordsworth (canon of Westminster, high-Anglican, patristic, devout, and genial, but given to excessive typologizing and allegorizing, and avoiding critical difficulties: *Greek Testament, with Notes*, 1st ed., Lond. 1856; 4th ed., Lond. 1866, in 2 large vols.). Of these English commentators the American editor has especially compared the latest editions of Alford and Wordsworth. Ellicott, who is more critical than either, has not yet reached the Romans.

III. Commentaries on the Epistles of *St. Paul:* W. Paley (*Horæ Paulinæ*, or the truth of the Scripture history of St. Paul evinced by a comparison of the Epistles which bear his name with the Acts of the Apostles, and with one another, in many editions); John Fell (*A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the Epistles of St. Paul*, 3d ed., Lond. 1703); John Locke (*A Paraphrase and Notes on the Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians*, Lond. 1742, and in Locke's *Works*); G. Benson (Lond. 1752–'56, 2 vols.); James Macknight (A new literal translation, from the original Greek of all the apostolical Epistles, with a commentary, etc., Lond. 1795, and other editions of 1, 4, or 6 vols.); T. W. Peile (*Annotations on the Apostolical Epistles*, Lond. 1848–'52, 4 vols.); Abp. Sumner (*Apostolical Preaching considered in an Examination of St. Paul's Epistles*, 9th ed., Lond. 1845); Conybeare and Howson (*Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, Lond. 1852, reprinted in New York in several editions); B. Jowett (*The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans*, with critical notes and dissertations, Lond. 1855); Vaughan (*The Epistles of St. Paul, for English Readers*, Lond. 1864).

IV. *Special* commentaries on the *Epistle to the Romans:* A. Willet (*Hexapla:* that is, a sixfold commentarie upon the most divine epistle of the holy Apostle St. Paul to the Romans, etc., Lond. 1620); Bp. Terrot (Lond. 1828); R. Anderson (3d ed., Lond. 1837); Bp. Parry (Lond. 1832); Moses Stuart (Congregationalist, 1st ed., Andover, 1832; 2d ed., 1835, 6th ed., Lond. 1857); Charles Hodge (O. S. Presbyterian, 1st ed., Philad. 1835, new edition, enlarged and revised, 1866); Thomas Chalmers (*Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans*, Glasgow, 1837, 4 vols. 12mo.); R. Haldane (new ed., Lond. 1842, in 3 vols.); Abp. Sumner (*A Practical Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans and* 1 *Corinthians*, Lond. 1843); W. Walford (*Curæ Romanæ*, Lond. 1846); W. W. Ewbank (*Commentary*, etc., Lond. 1850–'51, 2 vols.); S. H. Turner (Episcopalian, *The Epistle to the Romans, in Greek and English;* with an analysis and exegetical commentary, New York, 1853); Robt. Knight (*A Critical Commentary*, etc., Lond. 1854); E. Purdue (Dublin, 1855); A. A. Livermore (Boston, 1855); John Cumming (*Sabbath Evening Readings on the Romans*, Lond. 1857); John Brown (*Analytical Exposition of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, Edinb. 1857); James Ford (*St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, illustrated from Divines of the Church of England*, Lond. 1862); John Forbes, LL.D. (*Analytical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, tracing the train of thought by the aid of Parallelism* Edinb. 1868). The work of Forbes is based upon the discovery that Parallelism is not confined to the poetry of the Bible, but extends also to many portions of its prose. It is not a full commentary, but an illustration of those passages alone which Parallelism seems to place in a new and clearer light.—P. S.]

[SAINT PAUL.

CHRIST! I am Christ's! and let the name suffice you;
  Aye, for me, too, He greatly hath sufficed;
Lo, with no winning words I would entice you;
  Paul has no honor and no friend but Christ.

Yes, without cheer of sister or of daughter—
  Yes, without stay of father or of son,
Lone on the land, and homeless on the water,
  Pass I in patience till the work be done.

Yet, not in solitude, if Christ anear me
  Waketh Him workers for the great employ;
Oh, not in solitude, if souls that hear me
  Catch from my joyance the surprise of joy.

Hearts I have won of sister or of brother,
  Quick on the earth or hidden in the sod;
Lo, every heart awaiteth me, another
  Friend in the blameless family of God.

Yea, thro' life, death, thro' sorrow and thro' sinning,
  He shall suffice me, for He hath sufficed;
Christ is the end, for Christ was the beginning,
  Christ the beginning, for the end is Christ.

From a poem by FREDERIC W. H. MYERS, [illegible]

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

ROMANS.

THE INSCRIPTION, INTRODUCTION, AND FUNDAMENTAL THEME.

CHAP. I. 1–17.

THE APOSTLESHIP OF PAUL, APPOINTED FOR THE GLORY OF THE NAME OF GOD THROUGH THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST, AND FOR THE REVELATION OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD FOR FAITH IN ALL THE WORLD, AMONG THE JEWS AND GENTILES, AND ESPECIALLY ALSO IN ROME.

I.

Inscription and Salutation.

CHAP. I. 1–7.*

TO THE ROMANS.[1]

1 Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ,[2] called *to be* an apostle [a called, chosen
apostle, *κλητὸς ἀπόστολος*], separated [set apart, *ἀφωρισμένος*] unto the gospel of
2 God (Which he had promised afore [which he promised beforehand, *προεπηγ-
γείλατο*] by [through] his prophets in the holy Scriptures[3]) [*omit* parenthesis],
3 Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord [*omit* here the words: Jesus Christ our
Lord, and transfer them to the close of ver. 4], which [who] was made [born[4]] of [from,
4 ἐκ] the seed of David according to the flesh; And [*omit* And] declared *to be* [who
was installed][5] the Son of God with [in] power,[6] according to the Spirit of
holiness, by [from, ἐξ][7] the resurrection from [of] the dead[8] [—Jesus Christ our
5 Lord] By [through] whom we have received [we received] grace and apostle-
ship, for [unto, *εἰς*, *i. e.*, for the purpose of, with a view to, in order to bring about] obedience to
the faith [of faith][9] among all [the] nations, for his name [name's sake]:
6 Among whom are ye also the called [, the chosen ones] of Jesus Christ:[10]
7 To all that be in Rome,[11] beloved of God [To all the beloved of God who are
in Rome], called *to be* [chosen] saints: [.][12]
Grace to you,[13] and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

TEXTUAL.

[1] [Πρὸς Ῥωμαίους. This is the oldest and simplest title of Codd. ℵ. (Sin.) A. B. C., and has been adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Lange, &c., in the place of the title of the *textus receptus*: Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἡ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολή. For other titles, see the *apparatus criticus* in Tischendorf.—P. S.]

---

* [It was thought best to separate the three distinct sections embraced in chap. i. 1–17, viz.: I. The Address and Salutation, vers. 1-7. II. The Epistolary Introduction, vers. 8-15. III. The Theme of the Epistle, vers. 16, 17. Dr Lange presents them as one whole, which, with our numerous additions, would make it too long and inconvenient for reference.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 1.—The reading Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is confirmed by most authorities [Codd. ℵ. A. E. G., and adopted by Lachmann, Alford], against the reading, *Christ Jesus* (Cod. B., Tischendorf).

[3] Ver. 2.—[ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις, literally *in sacred writings* (without the article), but better, with the E. V., *in the Holy Scriptures.* γραφαῖς was sufficiently defined by ἁγίαις to be understood by the readers as referring to the Old Testament. So is πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, ver. 4, and πνεῦμα ἅγιον repeatedly without the article. Comp. Winer, *Gr. of the N. T.*, § 19, 2 b. (p. 113, 6th ed., p. 119, 7th ed., by Lünemann). Meyer insists that the omission of the article (ταῖς) indicates that only those portions or passages of the Old Testament were meant here, which contain Messianic prophecies, and he refers in proof to γραφῶν προφητικῶν in chap. xvi. 26 (where, however, *the* prophetical portions of the Old Testament are meant). But Fritzsche, De Wette, Tholuck, Philippi, Alford, Lange (*Exeg. Notes*), and most commentators regard γραφαὶ ἅγιαι as a proper noun for the whole Old Testament. And, in fact, it is the whole Bible, as an organic unit, from Genesis to Malachi, which bears witness to Christ, comp. John v. 46.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 3.—[γενομένου can only be said of the *human* nature of Christ which began in time, while His *divine* nature is without beginning and without end. Mark the difference between ἐγένετο and ἦν in John i. 1, 3, 6. Comp. also Gal. iv. 4: ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον. Some Minuscule MSS. read γεννωμένου for γενομένου.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 4.—[ὁρισθέντος, *decreed, constituted, ordained, inaugurated.* Bengel: "ὁρισθέντος *multo plus dicit quam* ἀφωρισμένος, ver. 1: *nam* ἀφορίζεται *unus e pluribus,* ὁρίζεται *unicus quispiam*, Acts x. 42." ὁρίζειν (from ὅρος, limit) means, 1. to limit, to set bounds; 2. to define (of ideas); 3. to fix, to appoint or constitute, especially with the double accusative (Acts x. 42; xvii. 31). The last meaning alone can apply here. Dr. Lange translates *festgestellt, established.* Some of the best commentators (Chrysostom, Luther, Fritzsche, Olshausen, Philippi, Robertson, Alford, Hodge, and even Meyer) understand it here of a mere *declaration*, or a *subjective* manifestation and *recognition* of Christ as the Son of God in the hearts of men. But there is confessedly no instance where ὁρίζειν means *to declare, to manifest, to prove.* And then the human recognition of the Messiahship of Christ was the result of an act of God. Paul speaks here not of the preëxistent, but of the *incarnate* Christ, of the God-*Man*. Under this view Christ was divinely *decreed* and objectively *fixed, constituted,* and *inaugurated* as the Son of God in power or majesty (ἐν δυνάμει is to be connected with υἱοῦ, not with the verb) at His resurrection, which implied the principle and germ of the resurrection of all believers, and by which the man Jesus was exalted and made partaker of the divine glory of the Logos in His preëxistent state. Comp. Phil. ii. 9–11; John xvii. 5. In a similar sense ποιεῖν is used, Acts ii. 36: "God hath made this Jesus whom ye have crucified, Lord and Christ." Paul had probably in mind the divine decree (חֹק, Sept. πρόσταγμα), Ps. ii. 7: "Thou art my Son: this day have I begotten thee," which he expressly refers to the resurrection, Acts xiii. 33; comp. Heb. i. 5; v. 5. This is, of course, not to be understood in the Socinian sense, which denies the *eternal* Sonship of Christ; on the contrary, the *eternal* Sonship (Rom. viii. 3; Gal iv. 4; Col. i. 15; Phil. ii. 7) precedes and underlies the *historical* Sonship, just as the Divinity of Christ is necessarily implied in His incarnation; for He could never have become *God-Man*, if He had not been God before. The eternal, metaphysical Sonship of the Logos, which is coëqual with the Father, was indicated by Paul in ver. 3, τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, before speaking of the incarnation, and is, in its nature, incommunicable; but the historical Sonship of the God-Man, which dates indeed from the incarnation (Luke i. 35), but was not fully developed, publicly established, and made manifest till the resurrection, is communicated to believers; first germinally in regeneration, whereby they are made "sons of God," Rom. viii. 14, and fully in their resurrection, viii. 23, when what is here sown in *weakness* will be raised in *power* (ἐν δυνάμει), 1 Cor. xv. 43. Hence the risen Saviour is called "the first-born among many brethren," Rom. viii. 29; "the first-born from the dead" (πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν), Col. i. 18; Rev. i. 5. Comp. Dr. Lange, *Exeg. Notes*, p. 61. Forbes, *Analyt. Com.*, p. 94, and Cremer, *Bibl. theol. Wörterbuch, sub.* ὁρίζω. The translation of the Vulgate: *qui prædestinatus est Filius Dei*, rests on a false reading or gloss: προορισθέντος.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 4.—[ἐν δυνάμει may be connected adverbially with ὁρισθέντος (= τοῦ ἐν δυν. ὁρ.), *with power, powerfully, effectually, kräftiglich, gewaltig* (Luther, Olshausen, De Wette, Meyer, Alford, Hodge), or better adjectively with the preceding noun υἱοῦ θεοῦ, *in power* (Melanchthon: "*Declaratus est esse Filius Dei potens,*" Philippi, Hofmann, Lange). In the former case, the words refer to the resurrection as an exhibition of the Divine power; in the latter, they contrast the majesty and power of the risen Son of God with the weakness of His human nature, the ἀσθένεια, implied in σάρξ.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 4.—[Dr. Lange translates ἐξ *von-aus, from, out of,* as indicating the origin, corresponding to ἐκ σπέρματος, ver. 3. Bengel: "ἐκ *non modo tempus, sed nexum rerum denotat.*" The preposition ἐκ marks in both cases, vers. 3, 4, the source *from* or *out* of which the relation springs. The seed of David is the source of the human nature of Christ; the resurrection is the starting-point of His divine nature, not in its preëxistent state, of course, but in its *objective historical manifestation* and *public* recognition among men. Comp. *Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 4.—[ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν, *the resurrection of the dead, Todten-auferstehung,* is not identical with ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν, *resurrection from the dead* (E. V.), but is a stronger summary expression which comprehends the resurrection of Christ and the believers as one connected whole or single fact, inasmuch as the resurrection of Christ, who is "the Resurrection and the Life" itself, implies and guarantees the resurrection of all the members of His mystical body; comp. John xi. 25; Acts iv. 2; xvii. 32; xxiii. 6; xxvi. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 12. Alford: "We must not render as E. V. 'the resurrection *from* the dead,' but 'the resurrection *of* the dead,' regarded as accomplished in that of Christ." Comp. also Philippi and Wordsworth.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 5.—[εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως (without the article) occurs once more, Rom. xvi. 26, and may be translated as a compound noun: *Glaubensgehorsam.* The words express the design and object of Paul's apostleship, viz., that through its instrumentality all the nations be brought to a saving faith in Christ. The different views on the meaning of πίστις, whether it be objective faith, *fides quæ creditur*, or subjective faith, *fides qua creditur*, do not affect the translation. See *Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 6.—[The E. V. and Dr. Lange make a comma after ὑμεῖς, and regard κλητοὶ Ἰ. Χρ. as being in apposition to ὑμεῖς. So also the New Testament of the Am. Bible Union, which, however, omits the article before *called*, and renders: *among whom are ye also, called of Jesus Christ.* But Lachmann, Tischendorf, De Wette, Meyer, Alford, omit the comma and connect κλητοί as the predicate with ἐστέ: "*Among whom ye also are called of Jesus Christ;*" Meyer: "*Unter welchen auch ihr Berufene Jesu Christi seid.*" Alford thinks that the assertion *among whom are ye*, with a comma after ὑμεῖς, would be flat and unmeaning. This, however, is not the case. See *Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 7.—[ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ver. 7, and τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ver. 15, are omitted in Cod. G. Börn. and Schol. Cod. 47, but this omission is too isolated to have any critical weight. Comp. Meyer against Reiche's inference.—P. S.]

[12] Ver. 7.—[According to the usual construction still adhered to by Wordsworth, who makes a comma after ἁγίοις, the first seven verses form but one sentence, in which case we would have a double subject, viz., Παῦλος and χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη instead of χάριν καὶ εἰρήνην (λέγει), and a repetition of the persons addressed, viz., τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ and ὑμῖν. But it is impossible that such a gross grammatical irregularity should occur not only here, but in all the Pauline Epistles, as also in 1 and 2 Peter, Jude, and Apoc. i. 4. The nominative χάρις and εἰρήνη, as well as the ὑμῖν, clearly indicate that the second clause of ver. 7 (which should be divided into two verses) forms a complete sentence by itself and contains the *salutation* proper, while the preceding words form the *inscription*. Hence there should be a period before χάρις. So Knapp-Goeschen, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Theile-Stier, Alford, in their editions, as well as most of the modern commentators. Tholuck is wrong when he says that Fritzsche was the first to suggest this division. Beza already did it. "*Novam hic periodum incipio, adscripto puncto post* ἁγίοις."—P. S.]

[13] Ver. 7.—[*Grace to you,* without *be,* is in accordance with the Greek and the Vulg. (*gratia vobis et pax*) and preferable. The E. V. is inconsistent, sometimes inserting *be* and sometimes omitting it. The verbal form to be supplied after χάρις in this case would not be the annunciative or mandatory ἔστω, *be*, but the optative εἴη, *may be;* for the χάρις ὑμῖν is not an elliptical doxology, nor an authoritative benediction, but a prayer or earnest wish; comp. 1 Peter i. 2, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη; Jude 2, ἔλεος . . . πληθυνθείη.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

First Section.—*Inscription and greeting.—Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an Apostle, set apart for the Gospel of God.—His gospel in harmony with the Old Testament (of the Jews): A gospel of Christ, who, in His human nature and His historical pedigree, is the Son of David; but who, in His spiritual glory, appears as the principle of the resurrection of the dead, and as the one appointed to be the Son of God in power (majesty). By this glorified Christ the Apostle has received his Christian and apostolic call, for the purpose of calling all nations to obedience to the faith.—All the believers in Rome belong to this totality. He accordingly greets the Christians in Rome with the apostolic salutation.*

[General Remarks on the Apostolic Salutations.—On the grammatical structure of the two sentences, vers. 1–7, see textual note [12] to ver. 7. St. Paul opens his Epistles with his name and official title, by which he challenges respectful attention to his inspired teaching, and with the assurance of his brotherly regard and love for the readers, by which he wins their affections. The ancient epistolary style unites in a brief inscription what we now distinguish as address, greeting, and subscription. Paul combines the heathen and the Hebrew form of salutation, and inspires both with a deep Christian meaning.

The Greek and Roman epistolary inscription contained simply the name of the writer in the nominative, and the name of the receiver in the dative (*e. g.*, *Πλάτων Διονυσίῳ*, *Cicero Attico*), frequently with the addition of the wish for health and prosperity, by the words *εὖ πράττειν*, more usually *χαίρειν*, or *χαίρειν λέγει*, *salutem*, or *salutem dicit*. This form we find in the New Testament three times: once in the heathen sense, in the letter of Lysias to the Roman governor Felix, Acts xxiii. 26 (*Κλαύδιος Λυσίας τῷ . . . Φήλικι χαίρειν*), and twice in the Christian sense, namely in the circular letter of the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem, which was probably written by James, Acts xv. 23 (*οἱ ἀπόστολοι . . . τοῖς . . . ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν χαίρειν*), and in the Epistle of James, chap. i. 1 (*Ἰάκωβος . . . ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς . . . χαίρειν*).* From 2 John, ver. 10 (*χαίρειν αὐτῷ μὴ λέγετε*), it appears that Greek Christians were in the habit of greeting one another with the usual *χαῖρε* (Vulg., *ave*, comp. Matt. xxvi. 49; xxvii. 29; xxviii. 9; Mark xv. 18; Luke i. 28; John xix. 3). But the heathen formula, as implying a prayer to the gods, had in it a taint of idolatry, or, at all events, it referred only to *temporal* prosperity, and had to give way before long to a change in accordance with Christian feeling.

The Hebrew (and Arabic) form of salutation is שָׁלוֹם, *εἰρήνη*, *Peace*, or שָׁלוֹם לָךְ, LXX., *εἰρήνη σοι*, *Peace be with you;* comp. Gen. xxix. 6; xliii. 23; Ex. xviii. 7; Judges vi. 23; 1 Sam. x. 4; Dan. x. 19; Luke x. 5, 6, &c. (With the later Jews the usual formula was ירשׁר). The risen Saviour greeted thus the assembled disciples, John xx. 19, 26, bringing the true peace of the soul with God, which He, the Prince of Peace, had bought by His atoning death and triumphant resurrection (comp. John xiv. 27; xvi. 33; Matt. x. 12, 13).

Combining the Græco-Roman inscription and the Hebrew salutation, we would have this form: "*Paul to the Romans. Health and peace be with you.*"

But Paul transforms the Greek *χαίρειν* and the Hebrew *shalom* from the prevailing idea of physical health and temporal comfort, into the deep meaning of the saving grace and peace of God in Christ, and comprehends in the two words *χάρις* and *εἰρήνη* the richest blessings of the gospel; *χάρις* being the objective cause of the Christian salvation, and *εἰρήνη* its subjective effect in the soul of man. At the same time, there is, no doubt, a reference in this epistolary greeting to the Mosaic, or rather Aaronic benediction, Num. vi. 25, 26: "The Lord make His grace shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee (יְחֻנֶּךָּ, from חָנַן, *gratiosus fuit*, hence חֵן, *χάρις*), the Lord lift up His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace (שָׁלוֹם, LXX., *εἰρήνην*)." We find this salutatory grace and peace not only in the Epistles of Paul, but also in those of Peter and of John in the Apocalypse. In the Pastoral Epistles, 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2, and Titus i. 4 (*text. rec.*), Paul, with reference probably to the Greek version of the Aaronic benediction, Num. vi. 25 (*ἐλεήσει σε* for יְחֻנֶּךָּ), adds to the prayer for *grace* and *peace* that of *mercy* (*ἔλεος*), which ministers of the gospel need more than any other class of men. This threefold blessing, corresponding to the threefold Aaronic benediction, we find also in 2 John 3.*

In the Epistle to the Romans, where Paul, contrary to his habit, addressed a congregation which he had not founded, or even visited, he amplifies the Græco-Hebrew inscription and salutation still more, and inserts parenthetically some of the fundamental doctrinal ideas of the Epistle, as suggested by the mention of "the gospel of God," namely: (1.) The connection of the gospel with the Old Testament revelation, ver. 2; (2.) the divine-human nature of Christ, who is the subject of that gospel, vers. 3, 4; (3.) his call to the apostleship of all the Gentiles by Christ, which gives him a right to address himself also to the Romans, ver. 5. In the richness of this salutation we see the overflowing fulness of Paul's mind, and the importance he attached to this Epistle. Calvin: *Epistola tota sic methodica est, ut ipsum quoque exordium ad rationem artis compositum sit.*—P. S.] †

Ver. 1.—**Paul.**—Saul as Paul, *i. e.*, the Small, in opposition and contrast to Bar-Jesus, Elymas the Sorcerer of Cyprus, Acts xiii. 8. [Saul and Paul. Paulos is the Hellenistic, Paulus the Latin form for the Hebrew Saul, though differing from it in meaning. It was chosen as the nearest allusive and alliterative equivalent, and as a name already

* [Outside of the New Testament the salutatory *χαίρειν* is also found in several epistles of Ignatius, in the epistle of (pseudo-) Barnabas, and in other ancient Christian documents; comp. Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 4; iv. 26.—P. S.]

* [In post-apostolic literature, Clement of Rome wishes the Corinthians *χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη*. Polycarp, *ad Phil.*, instead of this, has *ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη* (comp. Gal. vi. 16: *εἰρήνη ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεος*). The *Martyrium Polycarpi*, in its inscription, prays for *ἔλεος, εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη*, which corresponds with the formula in Jude 2. In the epistle of the congregations of Southern Gaul, A. D. 167 (Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 1–4), we have *εἰρήνη καὶ χάρις καὶ δόξα*.—P. S.]

† [Besides the commentaries, comp. J. B. Bittinger: *The Greetings of Paul*, in the *Am. Presb. and Theol. Review* for Jan. and April, 1867; and especially J. C. Theo. Otto: *Ueber den apostolischen Segensgruss* χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη, *und* χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη, in the *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, vol. xii. No. 4 (Gotha, 1867), pp. 678–697.—P. S.]

familiar to the Greeks; while SAUL, as a proper name, was unknown to them. The name *Saul*—the most distinguished name in the genealogy of the tribe of Benjamin, to which Paul belonged (Rom. xi. 1; Phil. iii. 5; comp. Acts xiii. 21)—the Apostle used among the Jews, the name *Paul* among the Gentiles, and in the later part of his life exclusively. The Jews and early Christians often had two names, either similar in sound and identical in meaning, as *Silas* and *Silvanus* (the former occurring uniformly in the Acts thirteen times, the latter four times in the Epistles), *Lucas* and *Lucanus* * (Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 11; Philem. 24); or similar in sound but different in meaning, as *Jesus* and *Justus* (Col. iv. 11), *Saul* and *Paul*, *Hillel* and *Pollio;* or different in sound but identical in meaning, as *Cephas* (Hebrew) and *Peter* (Greek); or different both in sound and meaning, as *Jacob* and *Israel*, *Simon* and *Peter*, *Bartholomew* and *Nathanael*, *John* and *Mark* (Acts xii. 12, 25), *Simeon* and *Niger* (xiii. 1), *Barsabas* and *Justus* (i. 23). It is possible that the Apostle Paul, as a Roman citizen, received this name in early youth in Tarsus (Lightfoot), or inherited it from some ancestor, who may have adopted it in becoming a freedman, or in acquiring the Roman citizenship; *Paul* being the well-known *cognomen* of several distinguished Roman families, as the *gens Æmilia*, *Fabia*, *Julia*, *Sergia*, &c. It is more probable, however, that he chose the name himself after he entered upon his labors among the Gentiles, as a part of his missionary policy to become a Greek to the Greeks, in order to gain them more readily to Christ (1 Cor. ix. 19–23). At all events, the name *Paul* is first mentioned during his first great missionary journey, when he, taking henceforth precedence of Barnabas in words and in acts, struck Elymas the sorcerer with blindness, and converted Sergius Paulus, the pro-consul of Cyprus, to the Christian faith (Acts xiii. 8). After this striking fact, he is uniformly called *Paul* in the latter chapters of the Acts, and in all the Epistles. But we have no right, for this reason, to infer (with Jerome, Olshausen, Meyer, Ewald, and others) that the name *Paul* was a memorial of the conversion of Sergius Paulus as his first-fruit. For (1.) he may have converted many Jews and Gentiles before that time; (2.) pupils are called after their teachers and benefactors, and not *vice versâ;* (3.) Luke gives no intimation to that effect, and connects the name *Paul*, not with that of the proconsul of Cyprus (xiii. 7, 12), but with that of Elymas the sorcerer (ver. 8). The last circumstance favors the ingenious hypothesis of Dr. Lange, that the name expresses the symbolical significance of the victory of Paul, the *small man* of God, over Elymas, the *mighty magician* of the devil, as a New Testament counterpart of the victory of David over Goliath, or of Moses over the sorcerers of Egypt. Dr. Lange, however, admits the probability that Paul had his Roman name before this occasion. At all events, the change of name has nothing whatever to do with his conversion; and all allegorical interpretations of Chrysostom, Augustine, Wordsworth, and others, which go on this assumption, are merely pious fancies, which are sufficiently refuted by the fact that the Apostle is repeatedly called *Saul* long *after* his conversion, as in Acts ix. 25, 30; xii 25; xiii. 1, 2, 7, 9; and that it is said of *Saul* in one passage (xiii. 9), that he was "filled with the Holy Ghost."—P. S.] *

A servant of Jesus Christ.—עֶבֶד יְהוָה. This is not merely the general designation of the pious man (Fritzsche: *Christi cultor*, Eph. vi. 6), but the designation of his office (Tholuck); 1 Cor. iv. 1; Phil. i. 1; James i. 1. Reiche: The word implies unlimited obedience. Schott: "δοῦλος denotes the Christian, so far as he, in the discharge of a special Christian calling, surrenders himself completely to God's will, and excludes his own preference." Here the Christian call in its universal character is meant, just as it appears in the apostleship, after the absolute service of the one great servant of God, Is. liii. Nevertheless, there is no tautology in the addition: *called to be an apostle.* Calvin: *Apostolatus ministerii est species.* The same office, related to Christ, makes the δοῦλος, in the absolute sense (comp. Is. liii.); but, related to the world, it makes the ἀπόστολος. [*A servant*, literally *bondsman* (δοῦλος, from δέω, *to bind*), denotes generally, like the corresponding Hebrew עֶבֶד יְהוָה, a relation of dependence on God, and cheerful obedience to His will. Paul glories in this service, which is perfect freedom. The more we feel bound by the authority of Christ, the more we are free from the bondage of men. *Deo servire vera libertas est* (Augustine). In a wide sense, the term applies to all believers, who are both *children* and *servants* of God (Is. lxv. 13; Dan. iii. 26; Rom. vi. 22; xiv. 4; Eph. vi. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 22; 1 Peter ii. 16; Rev. xix. 2, 5); in a special and emphatic sense, it is used of the chosen office-bearers in the kingdom of God, as Moses, the prophets, and kings in the Old Testament (Deut. xxxiv. 5; Josh. i. 1; Is. xlix. 5; Jer. xxv. 4), and the ministers of the gospel in the New, particularly the apostles (so here; Phil. i. 1; Tit. i. 1; Col. iv. 12; James i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1; Rev. i. 1). Hodge: "*Servant* is a general official designation, of which, in the present case, *apostle* is the specific explanation." Paul "rejects all human authority in matters of faith and duty, and yet professes the most absolute subjection of conscience and reason to the authority of Jesus Christ." Wordsworth: "Other men, in the beginning of their epistles, especially those which they addressed to the Roman people, recited their own titles as rulers, kings, or conquerors; but the apostles claim to be heard as δοῦλοι, *bondsmen*,

* [*Lucanus* does not occur in the Greek Testament, but in several Latin MSS. the third Gospel is inscribed: *Evangelium secundum Lucanum.* The Greek Λουκᾶς is, no doubt, a contraction of the Latin *Lucanus*, as Σίλας is of *Silvanus.* Some commentators, however, identify the names *Lucas* and *Lucius* (Acts xiii. 1; Rom. xvi. 21.)—P. S.]

* [I add, as a curiosity, a quotation from Dr. Wordsworth, who, in his Com. on Acts xiii. 9, uncritically combines all the various interpretations of the name (except Dr. Lange's, which was then not yet known to him), and assigns no less than eight reasons for the change of *Saul* into *Paul:* (1.) Because Σαῦλος was a purely Jewish name. (2.) Because among the Greeks it might expose him to contempt, as having the same sound as σαῦλος, *wanton* (see Homer, *Hymn. Mercur.*, 28, and Ruhnken *in loc.*). (3.) To indicate his *change* and call to a new life; from a Jew to a Christian; from a persecutor to a preacher of the gospel. (4.) But in the change much of the original name was left and commemorated what he *had been.* The fire of zeal of Σαῦλος still glowed in the heart of Παῦλος, but its flame was purified by the Holy Ghost. (5.) His new name denoted also his mission to the Gentiles, the Romans being familiar with the name *Paulus.* (6.) It was a token of humility, *Paulus-parvulus* (1 Cor. xv. 9). (7.) It commemorated the cognomen of Paul's first (?) convert, *Sergius-Paulus*, and was a good augury of his future success in the Roman world. (8.) It indicates Paul's intended supremacy in the Roman or Western Church as distinct from the Aramaic name *Cephas*, and the Greek name *Peter.* —P. S.]

bondsmen of Jesus Christ." Comp., however, my annotation on ἀπόστολος, which is a title of dignity and authority.—P. S.]—**Jesus Christ.** That is, Jesus is the Christ. Dealing with the Roman Christians, the Apostle had no ground for saying the reverse: **Christ Jesus,** *i. e.*, The Christ is Jesus.

Called to be an apostle.—As he had had to defend his call before the Corinthians and Galatians on account of opponents, he does it here because he was not yet personally known to the Roman Church. [**Called**; *chosen*, *appointed*, not self-called, but called by *Christ*, in opposition to an arbitrary self-constituted authority (αὐτό-κλητος, self-appointed), and called *directly* by Christ, without the intervention of church authority, comp. Gal. i. 1: "Not of men (ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων), nor by any man (δι' ἀνθρώπου), but by Jesus Christ," &c. The word refers to the historical call, not to the eternal election. Calvin: *Neque enim iis assentior, qui eam de qua loquitur vocationem ad eternam Dei electionem referunt.*—P. S.] The expression, *apostle*, has here its widest significance. Christ, the Risen One, has called him; he is therefore, in the most positive sense, a witness of His resurrection, and this implies the apostolic witness of the whole of His miraculous person and work. [*Apostle* is a title of dignity, signifying the highest order of servant; every apostle being a servant of Christ, but not every servant an apostle of Christ. The one brings out the dependence of Paul on Christ, the other his authority over the congregations, and the latter is conditioned by the former. The term *apostle* may designate, etymologically, any delegate, commissioner, or missionary, but more particularly, as here, and in most passages, a chosen eye and ear witness of the life of Christ, who was personally instructed and selected by Him for the work of laying the foundation of the Christian Church, and teaching her through all subsequent generations. The apostles were inspired messengers of Christ, not to a particular charge, but to the whole world. The term is therefore generally restricted to the twelve (Luke vi. 13), and to Paul, who was likewise directly called by the Lord (Gal. i. 1, 12; Acts ix. 15; xxvi. 17). The sudden call of the persecuting Paul to the apostleship of the Gentiles corresponds to the sudden call of the Gentiles to Christianity, just as the gradual instruction of the Jewish apostles accords with the long training of the Jewish nation for the gospel.—P. S.]

Separated, set apart.—Not equal to *chosen of God* (De Wette), nor to *appointed by the Church* (with reference to Acts xiii. 2; Olshausen),* but directed to and appointed for this particular calling, through the whole providential course of his life (comp. Gal. i. 15). An ἀφορίζεσθαι first took place with him [at his birth, comp. Gal. i. 15: ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου, καὶ καλέσας, κ.τ.λ.; then.—P. S.] when he was sent from Tarsus to Jerusalem [?]; a second [third], at his conversion and retreat into Arabia; and a third [fourth], at his special appointment as the Apostle to the Gentiles (Acts xiii. 2 ff.; Gal. ii.). The biblical ὁρίζειν must be distinguished from προγινώσκειν or ἐκλέγεσθαι, as well as from καλεῖν; it denotes the Divine determination of the historical career of the man (see Acts xvii. 26). [Meyer refers ἀφωρισμένος to the historical call at Damascus, and compares σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς, Acts ix. 15; xxvi. 16 ff. The word is an explanation of κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, and gives us the additional idea of destination. It implies that Paul was selected from the world, singled out, consecrated to, and destined for the gospel service, at the time of his conversion. It refers to the Divine appointment for the apostolic office in *general*, while ἀφορίσατε, in Acts xiii. 2, refers to a *special* mission. ἀφορίζειν, like καλεῖν, looks to the historical call, προορίζειν to the eternal decree, but the former is only an execution in time or actualization of the latter.—P. S.]

Unto the gospel of God.—That is, not the gospel having God for its object (Chrysostom), but the gospel given by God (2 Cor. xi. 7) for promulgation. [It is the genitive, not of the object, but of origin and possession; **God's gospel,** whose author is God, and whose theme is Christ and His salvation by free grace; comp. vers. 3, 4; xv. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 2, 8, 9.—P. S.] **Gospel.*** Without the article.† According to De Wette and Schott, it is here not the internal matter or contents of the gospel, but the εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. [De Wette: *zur Verkündigung des Evangeliums.*—P. S.] Tholuck, on the contrary: "Εὐαγγέλιον does not stand for the infinitive εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, as we learn from the relative ὅ, but it is only an indefinite method of expression, as 2 Cor. ii. 12; x. 14." We would say, rather, that it is the *concrete* method of expression, implying that the knowledge of salvation cannot be without preaching, and preaching cannot be without the matter of the gospel.

Ver. 2. **Which He promised before by His prophets in the holy Scriptures.**—[So that God stood pledged, as it were, to reveal the gospel.] The second verse must not be read, with Beza [and the authorized English version, which often closely follows Beza], as parenthesis. The same expression occurs, 2 Cor. ix. 5 [τὴν προεπηγγελμένην εὐλογίαν ὑμῶν, your bounty before promised.—P. S.] The mention of the Old Testament promise of the gospel must not only authenticate the Apostle to the Jewish Christians, but it must also enforce the gospel for the Gentile Christians. This preceding promise lay specifically in the Messianic passages (De Wette); and, at the same time, according to the New Testament view, in the meaning of the whole of the Old Testament, which promised the universal Pauline gospel (see ch. x.). The expression γραφαί, without the article, does not denote *passages of Scripture* (Dr. Paulus [Meyer]), but γραφαὶ ἅγιαι has become, according to De Wette, a *nomen proprium.*‡ [The second verse teaches that the gospel is no abrupt innovation or afterthought, but the forethought of God, the fulfilment of His promise, and "the desire of all nations." This harmony of the New and Old Dispensations should be a con

* [Wordsworth, also, explains the word from Acts xiii. 2, where the Holy Ghost says: Ἀφορίσατε (the word here used by Paul) δή μοι τὸν Βαρνάβαν καὶ Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς, so that he was both κλητός and ἀφωρισμένος. Paul was not only *called* by God, but was also visibly *set apart* for the apostolic office by an outward *mission* and *ordination* at His command. But Acts xiii. 2 evidently refers to a *special* and joint mission of Barnabas and Saul.—P. S.]

* [The Anglo-Saxon *gospel*, *i. e.*, either good spell, or God's spell, is the precise equivalent for the Greek εὐαγγέλιον, *i. e.*, good news, glad tidings (of salvation). Geo P. Marsh, in his *Lectures on the English Language*, New York, 1860, p. 30, has a note on the two derivations, either from the name of the divinity *God*, or from the adjective *gôd*, *good*, and leans to the latter.—P. S.]

† [Comp. Winer, *N. T. Grammar*, p. 118 f ed. 7th, and Textual Note ³.—P. S.]

‡ [Comp. Textual Note ³.—P. S.]

vincing proof of the Divine origin of Christianity, not only to the Jews, who already believe in the Old Testament, and need only be convinced that Jesus of Nazareth was really the promised Messiah, but also to the heathen, who well know that it is the exclusive prerogative of God to foresee and prearrange the future. In this view, Christianity is the oldest as well as the latest religion, going back to the first promise in Paradise, and even beyond the beginning of time, to the eternal counsel of God. Augustine says: "The New Testament is concealed in the Old; the Old Testament is revealed in the New." **By his prophets**, is not to be confined, of course, to the sixteen prophetical books, but extends to the whole Old Testament Scriptures, as far as they contain the gospel, from the promise of the serpent-bruiser, Gen. iii. 25, to Mal. iv. 2. In fact, the entire Scripture is one organic system of prophecies and types bearing testimony to Christ; John v. 39. —P. S.]

Ver. 3. **Concerning his Son.**—This refers to εὐαγγέλιον, *gospel*, ver. 1,* and not to *promised*, ver. 2, as Tholuck, Meyer [Alford, Hodge], and others would have it. For the question further on is concerning the gospel in its complete New Testament development, and not merely in its Old Testament outline. Meyer says that the connection of περὶ with εὐαγγέλιον [instead of the *gen objecti*] does not elsewhere occur in the New Testament. But it must be noticed that here the act of preaching the gospel of evangelization is connected with the gospel itself. Besides, the parenthesis has its influence upon the expression.

Ver. 3, 4. **Who was born, &c.**—The words from γενομένου to νεκρῶν (vers. 3 and 4) are not an abrupt parenthesis (according to Griesbach and Knapp), but part of the sentence.* They characterize the Son of God, not according to the antithesis of the human and divine nature of Christ in itself, but according to the revelation of this antithesis in the national Old Testament limitation, and in the universal New Testament expansion and elevation of the person of Christ to heavenly majesty, in accordance with the analogy of Phil. ii. 6. Yet that ontological antithesis is reflected in this historical antithesis. The historical Christ has a double genealogy and history, which is represented in the following analogies and antitheses:

γενόμενος	*ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυείδ*	*κατὰ σάρκα.*
ὁρισθεὶς υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει	*ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν*	*κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης.*

[This antithetic parallelism, already hinted at by Bengel, is also brought out by Forbes (*Analyt. Com.*, p. 97), and may be more clearly and fully set forth in this way:

"Concerning His Son,
Who was born [Son of Man in weakness]
from the seed of David,
as to the flesh,
Who was installed Son of God in power
from the resurrection of the dead,
as to the Spirit of holiness,—
Even Jesus Christ our Lord."—P. S.]

The γενόμενος denotes not merely *the being born*, but, in a wider sense, the genealogical procession from the seed of David (see Matt. i. 1 ff.). [The house of David represented the flower of the Jewish nation, and foreshadowed the kingdom of Christ. That the Messiah was to proceed from this royal family, was predicted in the Old Testament, Is. xi. 1; Jer. xxiii. 5; Ps. cxxxii. 11; and generally expected by the Jews, Matt. xxii. 42; John vii. 42; Acts xiii. 23. Meyer, without good reason, confines ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυείδ to the *male* line of descent, and refers both genealogies of Matthew and Luke to Joseph; Melanchthon, on the contrary, identifies *ex semine David* with *ex virgine Maria;* and Wordsworth infers from the words that Mary, as well as Joseph, was of the lineage of David. Comp. Com. on the genealogies in Matt. i. and Luke iii. Alford: "The words ἐκ σπέρματος Δ. cast a hint back at the *promise* just spoken of. At the same time, in so solemn an enunciation of the dignity of the Son of God, they serve to show that, even according to the human side, His descent had been fixed in the line of him who was Israel's anointed and greatest king." —P. S.]

In distinction from this appearance of Christ in human nature, the idea of the exalted Christ is expressed by the words, ὁρισθεὶς υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει, **established as Son of God in power.** The attempt to analyze and divide this one conception (for example, in Luther's German translation) has obscured the passage very much. The Son of God, in distinction from His Old Testament origin, is absolutely destined (ὡρισμένος, Acts x. 42) to be the Son of God in majesty, or in the majestic exercise of his power (see Phil. ii. 6 ff.) The ὁρίζειν of God constitutes the central point of all kindred conceptions—of the ὁροθεσίαι, Acts xvii. 26; of the προορίζειν, Rom. viii. 29; and of the ἀφορίζειν, Gal. i. 15. It expresses here God's absolute determination or establishment concerning Christ as the centre of all the historical developments of the new world, the Head of all things (Matt. xxviii. 18; Eph. i. 20 ff.). The expression refers not to the Son of God as such simply, but to the Son of God as exalted to heavenly majesty. As such, He is ὁρισθείς, not merely προορισθείς, *prædestinatus* (Ambrose, Augustine,† Vulgate, &c., according to the Greek fathers, and the gloss προορισθέντος). But as He is the γενόμενος ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυείδ, his descent from David being the human and historical antecedence for his higher dignity; so is He ὁρισθεὶς υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐξ ἀναστάσεως

* [Grotius: "*Hoc refertur ad illud quod præcessit εὐαγγέλιον; explicatur nempe, de quo agat ille sermo bona nuntians.*" So also Calvin, Bengel, the E. V., and all who regard ver. 2 as a parenthesis. The sense in either case is the same. Christ is the great subject of the gospel.—P. S.]

* [So Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, who, in their editions, omit the parenthesis, and Meyer *in loc.* Comp Winer: *Grammar N. T.* p. 525, 7th ed.: *Viele längere Einschaltungen sind nicht Parenthesen, sondern Digressionen, sofern sie nur den Gedankenfortschritt, nicht der Lauf der Construction aufhalten.*"—P. S.]

† [*De præd. sanct.* c. 25. Augustine had but a superficial knowledge of Greek, and was here, as in Rom. v. 12 and in other passages, misled by the translation of the Vulgate, which reads: *prædestinatus* (προορισθέντος).—P. S.]

νεκρῶν. The *ἐκ*, according to the analogy of *ἐκ σπέρματος*, cannot merely mean *since* the resurrection, or *through* (*by*) the resurrection, but it indicates the origin: *out of* the resurrection. The *σπέρμα Δαυείδ* is the whole genealogy, or "the root of Jesse" (ch. xv. 12), as it became manifest by the birth from the Virgin. Thus, likewise, the resurrection is not merely the fact of the resurrection of Christ, but with the fact of the resurrection there are brought to light the strength and root of the resurrection of the dead in the world, (Eph. i. 19 ff.). It is in accordance with this that Christ can say: "I AM the resurrection and the life." Deep in the heart of the first world—for which Christ is the *first-born of every creature* (*πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, Col. i. 15)—there is at work the power, proceeding from the Logos, of a new world (Rom. viii. 23), for which Christ is the *first-born from the dead* (*πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*, Col. i. 18). And this world of the resurrection, which became manifest in His personal resurrection, continues now to operate dynamically, and will continue to do so until the flower of the new world appears in the first resurrection of the elect (1 Cor. xv. 23), and the fruit in the last general resurrection. The Apostle therefore means here the power of the resurrection as the christological principle of life in the world, which has become manifest by the resurrection of Christ, and acts and works as the historical principle of the universal resurrection of the dead. Christ arose from his death and resurrection as the fixed and established, or instituted Son of God in power. (Comp. the Messianic passage, Ps. ii.: "*This day* have I begotten Thee;" which denotes the very day of the seditious rebellion against the Messiah as the grand day of his glorification). The *destination* which Christ had from the beginning, became *inauguration* or *institution* at His resurrection. The *ὁρισθεὶς* therefore, does not merely mean "shown," "declaratively established" (Meyer, according to Chrysostom, *δειχθέντος*);* the *ἐκ* does not mean merely *since* or *after* (Theodoret, Erasmus, and others); and the *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* does not mean merely *ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν*. And Philippi, following Melanchthon, and others, has very properly connected the *ἐν δυνάμει* with *υἱοῦ θεοῦ*, and did not follow Luther, Meyer, and others in connecting it with *ὁρισθέντος*. Meyer has therefore no ground for opposing the explanation of Bengel—that our resurrection is comprehended in Christ's resurrection—by remarking that the term *the resurrection from the dead* is only the general expression of the category.

In the third antithesis, **κατὰ σάρκα, "according to the flesh,"** means the fleshly or physical origin of Christ, but not according to the first conception of *σάρξ*, *i. e.*, the sensuous, susceptible, vital fulness of corporeity, as distinct from and subjected to the spirit, or, in a more general sense, the "earthly man," *ἄνθρωπος χοϊκός* (1 Cor. xv. 47; Gen. ii.). Still less has flesh here the second meaning, viz., sinful sensuousness and susceptibility, as opposed to the spirit, and without it; or, in the more general sense, the "natural man," *ἄνθρωπος ψυχικός* (John iii. 6; 1 Cor. ii. 14). But *σάρξ* has here its third meaning, and expresses the physical human nature under the influence of the spirit (John i. 13; vi. 51), yet in historical relations, or man in his historical *finiteness*, *limitation*, and *qualification* (Gal. iv. 4). For Christ's incarnation, and the growth of His physical nature, evidently involved no opposition to the "Spirit of holiness," but took place under its consecrating influence.

[*Flesh* (*σάρξ*, בָּשָׂר) is here, and in all the passages where it is used of the incarnation (Rom. ix. 5; 1 Tim. iii. 16; John i. 14; 1 John iv. 2), a strong Hebraizing term for *human nature*, with the implied idea, perhaps, of weakness and frailty, though not necessarily of sin (somewhat analogous to the occasional use of the German *der Sterbliche*, and the English *mortal*, for *man*). It is as correct to say: Christ became *man* (*Menschwerdung*), as to say: Christ became *flesh* (*incarnatio*, *incarnation*, *Fleischwerdung*), but the latter expression is more emphatic; it exhibits more strongly the condescension of Christ, the identity of His nature with our own, and the universalness of His manhood. The word *σάρξ*, therefore, when applied to Christ, must not be understood in an Apollinarian sense, as if Christ merely assumed a human body with the animal soul, but not the rational soul, whose place was supplied by the divine Logos. It implies the *entire* human constitution, body, soul, and spirit, sin only excepted, which does not originally and necessarily belong to man. It is not the flesh, as opposed to the spirit, that is here intended, but the human, as distinct from the divine. The flesh, as an organized system of life, is the outward tabernacle and the visible representative of the whole man to our senses. The *σάρξ* of Christ was the seat of a human *ψυχή*, with its affections, and of a human *νοῦς* or *πνεῦμα*, with its intelligence (comp. Matt. xxvii. 50; John xi. 33; xix. 30), but not of the *ἁμαρτία*. He was subject to temptation, or temptable (Heb. ii. 18; iv. 15), but neither *σαρκικός* (Rom. vii. 14), nor *ψυχικός* (1 Cor. ii. 14). He appeared not "in the flesh of sin," but only "in the *likeness* of the flesh of sin" (Rom. viii. 2). At the same time, the limitation, *κατὰ σάρκα*, plainly implies the divine nature of Christ. "Were He a mere man," says Hodge, "it had been enough to say that He was of the seed of David; but as He is more than man, it was necessary to limit His descent from David to His human nature."—P. S.]

Ver. 4. According to the Spirit of holiness, *κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης*.—We accept, with Bengel, against Tholuck, that the *ἁγιωσύνη* is

* [Comp. my textual note No. [5]. Chrysostom: *Τί οὖν ἐστιν ὁρισθέντος; τοῦ δειχθέντος, ἀποφανθέντος, κριθέντος, ὁμολογηθέντος παρὰ τῆς ἁπάντων γνώμης καὶ ψήφου.* So Theophylact. Luther: *erwiesen*. Meyer agrees with this as to the sense, but insists that here as elsewhere *ὁρίζειν* with the double accusative means to appoint, designate, institute some one for something (Acts x. 42). Philippi (3d ed.): "*Christus ist als Sohn Gottes* DARGETHAN, ERWIESEN, *insofern er von den* MENSCHEN, *oder in der* UEBERZEUGUNG DER MENSCHEN, *durch die Auferstehung von den Todten dazu eingesetzt ist. Ganz parallel ist der Gedanke*, Acts xiii. 33." Alford: "The *ὁρίζειν* here spoken of is not the objective 'fixing,' 'appointing' of Christ to be the Son of God, but *the subjective manifestation in men's minds that He is so*. Thus the objective words *ποιεῖν* (Acts ii. 36), *γεννᾷν* (Acts xiii. 33), are used of the same *proof* or *manifestation* of Christ's Sonship by His resurrection. So again *ἐδικαιώθη*, 1 Tim. iii. 16." But all this is contrary to the meaning of *ὁρίζειν*, which denotes the *objective* fixing and appointing. Wordsworth explains somewhat differently: "Who was *defined* (as distinguished from all others) by a divine decree, and proclaimed to be the Son of God." He refers to Ps. ii. 7 as the best exposition of this text. "I will declare the decree (חֹק) whereby the Lord said unto me, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee*" Bengel refers to the same passage and remarks that חֹק here means the same as *ὁρισμός*, and that the divine decree implies, that the Father has *most determinately* said, *Thou art my Son*. The *ἀπόδειξις*, the *approving* of the Son, follows in the train of this *ὁρισμός*.—P. S.]

certainly distinguished from the ἁγιότης—just as *sanctimonia* is from *sanctitas*—in expressing the operation of the Spirit, though in a more comprehensive relation. This is the Spirit of God, who, as the sanctifying Spirit in the world, constitutes the complete opposition and counteraction to the entire corruption of sin; who was first the cause of the holy birth of Christ, and then of His resurrection; and who now proceeds from the glorified Christ as the principle of the sanctification of humanity and the world. Bengel: *Ante resurrectionem latebat sub carne Spiritus; post resurrectionem carnem penitus abscondit Spiritus sanctimoniæ.** We accept this statement in a wider sense. From the *divina natura* of Christ as *sanctificationis omnis causa* (Melanchthon, Calov, [Bengel, Olshausen], and others), we must distinguish the expression so far as it does not denote the individual, but the universal vital principle of the new birth of humanity. And we must distinguish it from the Holy Spirit, the πνεῦμα ἅγιον (Chrysostom, and most commentators; see Meyer),† so far as it denotes this principle, not merely according to its complete New Testament revelation, but also according to the Old Testament preparation of the divine-human life. But we must not make the distinction so that the πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης will represent the difference between the absolute communication of the Spirit to Christ and the relative operation of the πνεῦμα ἅγιον (Tholuck, Baur). We shall be secure against confounding the ideas, πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, λόγος or εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ (Rückert, Reiche), if we observe the difference between the universal and individual divine principle of life in revelation. This difference is most decidedly ignored by Baur, when he understands by the πνεῦμα ἁγ. the *Messianic Spirit*. When Clemens Romanus, Ep. ii., terms Christ *the first Spirit*,‡ he means the *individual* designation of the divine nature of Christ, yet according to its universal relation, just as the spirit of a man is the individual himself, but according to his universal relation.

[Κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης is evidently the antithesis or counterpart of κατὰ σάρκα, and as σάρξ here means the human nature of Christ, πνεῦμα must mean His divine nature, which is all *Spirit*, and intrinsically *holy*. ἁγιωσύνης is the genitive of qualification, showing that holiness is the essential characteristic of Christ's Spirit, and yet it distinguishes this from the πνεῦμα ἅγιον, which is the technical designation of the third person of the Trinity. Comp. John iv. 24: "God (*i. e.*, the divine being or nature which the three persons of the Trinity have in common) is Spirit;" 2 Cor. iii. 17, where Christ Himself is called "the Spirit;" 1 Tim. iii. 16: "justified in Spirit" (ἐν πνεύματι); Heb. ix. 14: "Who with an eternal Spirit (διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου) offered Himself without spot to God;" and 1 Peter iii. 18, where a somewhat similar distinction is made between the flesh and the spirit, or the human and divine nature of Christ: "Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit," although this passage is not exactly parallel. Meyer takes πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης to mean the ἔσω ἄνθρωπος, the whole inner life of Christ, which was elevated above all purely human spirits, filled with the Spirit of God, sinless and perfect. De Wette: "The *spiritual* side of the life of Christ, *yet* with the attribute of holiness partly as a quiescent quality, partly as an efficacious power emanating from it." Substitute for this: "The *Divine* side of Christ's person *with* the essential characteristic of holiness," &c., and we can adopt this explanation. If *flesh* means the whole human nature, it implies a human spirit, but not the πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, which is essentially Divine.—P. S.]

Of Jesus Christ our Lord.—[Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, ver. 4, in apposition with τοῦ υἱοῦ θεοῦ, anticipated in the E. V. ver. 3]. This expresses the relation of the exalted Son of God to the Apostle and the Roman Christians as the ground and bond of their union. They together accepted Jesus as the Christ of God, and served Him as their common Master. [Alford: "Having given this description of the person and dignity of the Son of God, very man and very God, he now identifies this divine person with **Jesus Christ**, the Lord and Master of Christians—the historical object of their faith, and (see words following) the Appointer of himself to the apostolic office." De Wette: "Ἰησ. Χρ. *bezeichnet den Sohn Gottes als historisch-kirchliche Erscheinung*." So Tholuck, Philippi. *Jesus* is the personal, *Christ* the official name; the former expresses His true character and mission and relation to the world, the latter His connection with the Old Testament and the promise of God. *Jesus, i. e., Saviour*, was the Hebrew name, announced by the angel before His birth, Matt. i. 25; Luke i. 31, and given at His circumcision, Luke ii. 21; *Christ*, the Greek equivalent for the Hebrew *Messiah, i. e.*, the *Anointed*, exhibits Him as the fulfiller of all the prophecies and types of the Old Testament, as the divinely promised and anointed Prophet, Priest, and King of Israel, who had for ages been the desire of all nations and the hope of all believers. *Lord* is here, and often, applied to Christ in the same sense in which the Septuagint uses κύριος for the Hebrew אֲדֹנָי and יְהוָֹה. See the Lexica. Christ is so called as the supreme Lord of the New Dispensation, or the sovereign Head of Christendom, to whom all believers owe allegiance and obedience.—P. S.]

Ver. 5. **Through whom we received.**—After stating the common relation of believers to Christ, there follows the account of the special relation of the Apostle to Him. It is plain that neither ver. 5 nor ver. 6 can be parenthetical; but here is prepared the whole treatment of the Epistle on the relation between the call of the Apostle and the call of the church at Rome. δι' οὗ. Christ is the personal means of communicating his call on God's part [or the mediatorial agent in conferring grace from God to man, comp. Gal. i. 1; 1 Cor. i. 9.—P. S.]. ἐλάβομεν (*received*) denotes not only the free divine gift, but also the living religious and moral appropriation by faith. It is plain that the plural here has reference to the call of Paul alone (not to the apostles in general, according to Bengel), from the following signature of his apostleship, by which he is the Apostle to the Gentiles.*

* [Bengel has a large note on πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης which is well worth reading in full. He regards ἁγιωσύνη, *sanctimonia*, as a kind of middle term between ἁγιότης, *holiness*, and ἁγιασμός, *sanctification*.—P. S.]

† [Wordsworth and Forbes also wrongly identify the πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης with the πνεῦμα ἅγιον, the third person in the Holy Trinity, and thereby destroy the obvious contrast of κατὰ πν. ἁγιωσ. and κατὰ σάρκα.—P. S.]

‡ [*Epist. ad* Cor. II. c. 9: Ὡς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος, ὁ σώσας ἡμᾶς, ὢν μὲν τὸ πρῶτον πνεῦμα, ἐγένετο σάρξ, καὶ οὕτως ἡμᾶς ἐκάλεσεν· οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ σαρκὶ ἀποληψόμεθα τὸν μισθόν. The Clementine origin of the *Second* Epistle to the Corinthians is very doubtful.—P. S.]

* [Comp. the note of Meyer *in loco* against Reiche, and of Alford against Peile, who infers that the subject of ἐλά-

Grace [in general] **and apostleship** [in particular.—P. S.]. *Grace*, as the operative call to salvation and to the full experience of salvation in justification, is the preliminary condition for every Christian office, and, above all, to the apostleship. The grand unfolding of his apostleship was therefore preceded by an extraordinary degree of grace [in his conversion]. The explanation, *χάριν ἀποστολῆς, grace of apostleship* (Hendiadys, so Chrysostom, Beza, Philippi, and others), obliterates the force of that preliminary condition; * but when the *grace* is regarded merely as pardoning grace (Augustine, Calvin), the fundamental part is mistaken for the whole. Thus, also, the extraordinary apostolic gifts (*χαρίσματα*) to which Theodoret, Luther, and others refer *χάριν*, presuppose grace (*χάρις*) already. Meyer understands the expression to mean Divine grace in general; that is, the translation into the communion of the beloved of God.

Unto obedience of faith [*εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως*, *zum Glaubensgehorsam*, comp. Rom. xvi. 26.—P. S.]. That is, for the purpose of establishing obedience to the faith. The *εἰς* denotes not merely the purpose, but also the operation of the apostleship;—an instance of Pauline conciseness. It may be asked here, whether the genitive *πίστεως* indicates the object, or must be read as apposition: the faith which consists in obedience [to the Word and Will of Christ.—P. S.].† But this question is limited by the second, whether *πίστις* can stand in the objective sense as *fides* QUÆ *creditur* [*quod credendum est, doctrina Christiana*.—P. S.]? Meyer denies this, and asserts that *πίστις*, in the New Testament, is constantly subjective faith [*fides* QUA *creditur, fides credens*.—P. S.], though it is often made objective, as here, and is regarded a power, or controlling principle.‡ But this would give us the idea of obedience toward the faithful. The obedience here meant is either identical with faith (the obedience which consists in faith, according to Theophylact, Calvin §), or it is obedience to faith in its objective form. The latter interpretation is supported by the expressions *ὑπακοὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 2 Cor. x. 5 [*ὑπακοὴ τῆς ἀληθείας*, 1 Peter i. 22], and particularly Acts vi. 7 ["a great company of priests *ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει*, became obedient to the faith," comp. Rom. x. 16: *ὑπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*.—P. S.]. Comp. 1 Peter i. 2, 14. But this *πίστις* cannot mean only *doctrina fidei*. Even obedience to the gospel (Rom. x. 16) does not express the most definite form of the objective *πίστις*: this is Christ Himself. An Epistle, sent to Rome by the ambassador of a Lord and King, who declared himself appointed to call all the peoples of the Roman Empire to obedience or allegiance, must have been planned in full consciousness of the antithesis, as well as of the analogy, between the earthly Roman Empire and the Kingdom of Christ. Therefore the Apostle expresses the analogy when he characterizes himself as an ambassador who appeals to the nations to be obedient to his Lord. But the antithesis lies in his denoting this obedience as an obedience to the faith. We must admit that the idea of the subjective faith also has here a good sense in itself. Faith is not at all arbitrary, but an obligatory obedience incumbent upon the inmost soul and conscience; yet its obedience is not slavish, but the joyous act of free faith, as it is *assensus* and *fiducia*. And if we accept this, the expression would be an oxymoron, like the expression: law of the Spirit. But since the question is concerning a characterization of the apostleship, the fuller idea must be expected: obedience toward the object of faith, especially as the freedom of faith is thereby also declared. Even the Christian's hope can be used in an objective sense (Col. i. 5).

Among all the nations (*ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*).—Since this expression constitutes one definition with the preceding, it is an improper alternative to refer it either to *ἐλάβ.* (Beza) or to *εἰς ὑπακ. πίστεως* (Meyer [Hodge]). We translate here, *among all the nations* (with Rückert, Reiche, Baur); not *among all Gentiles* (Tholuck, Meyer), because, from the following salutation, the Jews are included in the designation, and because it is in harmony with the purpose of the whole Epistle to establish a united congregation from among Jews and Gentiles. With this view, the subordinate idea of *heathen nations* is immediately introduced, yet not clearly before vers. 13, 14, &c. [Hodge: "The apostles were not diocesans, restricted in jurisdiction to a particular territory. Their commission was general. It was to all nations,"—yet with an amicable division of the immense field of labor; comp. Gal. ii. 9; Rom. xv. 20; 2 Cor. x. 16.—P. S.]

For the sake of his name.—(See Acts v. 41). Not for "the good" of His name; nor for the glorifying of the same (Meyer), which would have been expressed in the form of a doxology,* but for the spread of His name (Phil. ii. 10). Therefore the words are not an addition, but an explanatory parallel to the expression, "*for obedience to the faith*," &c., and relate, in common with this, to the antecedent. His name is the object of the faith to which the nations should render obedience in His name.

Ver. 6. **Among whom are ye also.**—We place here a comma, and read the words, *the called, the chosen ones of Jesus Christ*, as an address (with Rückert, Philippi, &c.); but not, *among whom are ye also called of Jesus Christ* (with Lachmann, Meyer [Alford], and others). For the principal weight

βομεν must be the same as the preceding ἡμῶν, overlooking the *formulary* character of the phrase ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν.—P. S.]

* [Alford: "Keep the *χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν* separate, and strictly consecutive, avoiding all nonsensical figures of Hendiadys, Hypallage, and the like. It was the general bestowal of grace which conditioned and introduced the special bestowal (*καὶ*, as so often, coupling a specific portion to a whole) of *apostleship*; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 10." Augustine: "*Gratiam cum omnibus fidelibus, apostolatum autem non cum omnibus communem habet.*"—P. S.]

† [Or rather: the obedience which consists in faith, in the act of believing.—P. S.]

‡ [Meyer, 4th ed. 1865, p. 43: "*πίστις für* DOCTRINA FIDEI *zu nehmen* (Beza, Tolet., Estius, Bengel, Heum., Cramer, Rosenm., Flatt, Fritzsche, Tholuck, *u. M.*), *ist durchaus gegen den Sprachgebrauch des N. T., in welchem die πίστις stets der* SUBJECTIVE *Glaube ist, obwohl oft, wie hier,* OBJECTIVIRT, *als Potenz gedacht. Vrgl.* xvi. 26; Gal. i. 23. *Die πίστις ist, nach P., die Ueberzeugung und Zuversicht* (ASSENSUS *und* FIDUCIA) *von Jesus Christus als dem einzigen und vollkommenen Vermittler der göttlichen Gnade und des ewigen Lebens, durch sein Versöhnungswerk.*"—P. S.]

§ [So also Hodge: "The obedience of faith is that obedience which consists in faith, or of which faith is the controlling principle." Wordsworth: "That I might bring all nations to that faith which manifests itself in hearkening to the Word, and in obedience to the Will, of God"—P. S.]

* [Not necessarily; comp. Acts ix. 16; xv. 26; xxi. 13, where the same phrase, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, occurs in the sense: for the glory of Christ. Meyer's interpretation is also adopted by Alford and Hodge. The words aptly express the final end of Paul's apostleship, which was, to promote the knowledge and glory of Christ. In the "name" of Christ is summed up all that He was, did, and suffered.—P. S.]

rests on the thought, that the Roman Christians were included in the totality of nations to which the Apostle was sent. He did not need to say first to them that they were the called of Jesus Christ. Thus we have the beautiful antithesis: I am the chosen Apostle for all nations: you are the chosen believers in the midst of all nations: we are therefore directed toward each other.

The called of Jesus Christ.—Not, whom Christ has called (Luther, Rückert, and others); but who, as the called [by the accepted call of God through the gospel], belong to and are subject to Him (the genitive of possession; Erasmus [Calvin, De Wette], Meyer, and others).* Paul refers the call (through Christ) to God (Rom. viii. 30, &c.; see Meyer). The Apostle seems, by this address, to anticipate the salutation itself; but the address must prepare the way for the salutation by the reminder that he can salute them as pertaining to him. [Hodge: "*Οἱ κλητοί, the called*, means the effectually called; those who are so called by God as to be made obedient to the call. Hence the *κλητοί* are opposed to those who receive and disregard the outward call. . . . Hence, too, *κλητοί* and *ἐκλεκτοί* are of nearly the same import; *κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοί*, Rom. viii. 28; comp. Rom. ix. 11; 1 Cor. i. 26, 27. We accordingly find *κλητοί* used as a familiar designation of believers." This is not quite correct. *κλητοί* and *ἐκλεκτοί* (a paronomasia in Greek, like the German *erwählt* and *auserwählt*) are clearly distinguished, Matt. xx. 16 and xxii. 14: *πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί, many are called, but few chosen;* in the last passage they are even put in antithesis. All the members of the visible Church are *κλητοί*, though they may ultimately be lost; but only the members of the invisible Church, or the true believers, are *ἐκλεκτοί*, or *κλητοὶ κατὰ πρόθεσιν* (Rom. viii. 28). Comp. the notes on Matt. xx. 16, in vol. i. p. 352 and 354 f.—P. S.]

Ver. 7. **To all that are in Rome.**—The address and the salutation.† The Epistle is addressed to all Christians in Rome. Residence in Rome and connection with the body of Roman Christians are certainly presupposed (see ver. 8). But the Roman Christians are saluted according to the condition of things, as an incipient church not yet fully organized, but destined to become so—an end to which this very Epistle was directed. The Apostle expresses himself otherwise in the Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, and Thessalonians. There he salutes the Christians as a church, or churches. [The Christians residing at Rome, whether born there or not, are viewed as one community, however imperfectly they may have been organized at the time; but they no doubt worshipped in different parts of the city, and were thus divided into various domestic congregations, *ἐκκλησίαι κατ' οἶκον*, xvi. 5. The population of the city of Rome at the time of Christ is variously estimated from one to two millions. In his earliest five epistles, Paul addresses himself *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, κ.τ.λ.*; in all the others, *τοῖς ἁγίοις*.—P. S.]

Beloved of God, called to be saints.—The root of their Christian faith is, that they know themselves beloved of God by the experience of His reconciliation; the goal and crown of their Christian faith is holiness. But they are not merely called to be saints (De Wette). As truly called, they are actually saints first in this sense: that, according to the analogy of theocratic holiness, they are separated from the ungodly world and consecrated to God; secondly, in the sense that Christ dwells in them as the principle of increasing holiness, and that they are characterized according to the ruling principle of their new life (1 Cor. vii. 14). This general designation does not imply that the Apostle could say it of every individual, still less that he should ascribe to individuals a personal holiness of life. [*κλητοί* has the same relation to *ἅγιοι* as *κλητός* has to *ἀπόστολος*, in ver. 1, and expresses the vocation of the Roman Christians to holiness, which is both an actual possession as to principle, and a moral aim to be realized more and more by daily growth in Christ.—P. S.]

Grace to you and peace.—The Greek *χαίρειν* (Acts xv. 23; James i. 1), and the Hebrew שָׁלוֹם לָכֶם, are here reflected unitedly in the infinitely richer Christian salutation. The grace which, as the cause of peace, has its source in God and Christ; the peace, as the operation of this cause, which becomes the source of new life in believers. The more definite Christian conception is destroyed if we substitute (with Meyer, against Olshausen, Philippi, and many others) salvation instead of *peace*, and kindness instead of *grace*. [*Grace* and *peace* are related to each other as cause and effect, and constitute the chief blessings of Christianity, embracing all that we need. The profound Christian meaning of *χάρις*—the redeeming love of God in Christ—and of *εἰρήνη*—the peace with God by the redemption—compared with the ordinary meaning of the Greek *χαίρειν* and the Hebrew *shalom*, affords a striking example of the transforming power which the genius of Christianity exercised over ancient language and custom. See the General Remarks on p. 57.—P. S.]

From God our Father.—The expression of the specifically Christian consciousness of God. The experience of pardon through Christ produces the consciousness of the *υἱοθεσία* (sonship, adoption) as a result.

And [from] the Lord.—[*Κυρίου Ἰ. Χρ.* is not dependent on *Πατρός* and parallel with *ἡμῶν*, but is ruled by *ἀπό* and is coördinate with *Θεοῦ Πατρός*. God is nowhere called "*our and* Christ's Father," and Christ never addresses God "*our*," but "*My* Father," owing to His peculiar relationship which is rooted in the *ὁμοουσία*, or equality of essence. This frequent coördination of Christ with the Father, as equally the object of prayer and the source of spiritual blessing, implies the recognition of the divinity of Christ. No Hebrew monotheist could thus associate, without blasphemy, the eternal Jehovah with a mere man. So also Philippi, Hodge, and others.—P. S.] Not *of* the Lord (Erasmus, Glöckler). Nevertheless, we would not read, with Meyer: *καὶ ἀπὸ κυρίου*, and not merely view Christ as *causa medians*, in distinction from the Father, as the *causa principalis*. For the dominion of the exalted Saviour must be distinguished from the mediatorship of Christ as *causa medians*. [God the Father is the author, Christ the mediator and procurer, the Holy Spirit the applier or imparter, of

* [Alford takes Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ not as the *genit. possessionis*, but as equivalent to *by* Jesus Christ. But the call of believers is uniformly referred to the Father. Alford quotes John v. 25 and 1 Tim. i. 12; but these passages are not to the point.—P. S.]

† [The salutation commences with *χάρις*, and should form a verse by itself. The first clause of ver. 7 connects with ver. 1 and indicates the readers. See Text. Note [12].—P. S.]

grace and peace. The Spirit takes them from Christ and shows them to the believer (comp. John xvi. 14). The latter may be the reason why the Holy Spirit is not especially mentioned in the epistolary salutations, except 2 Cor. xiii. 13, 14; 1 Peter i. 2. P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Epistle of the Apostle to the Romans on the righteousness of faith is still in a special sense a new message to the Romans, and a witness against Romanists. [It connects admirably with the concluding verses of the Acts, chap. xxviii. 30, 31, as a specimen of Paul's preaching in Rome, and to the Romans.—P. S.]

2. The significance of the Epistle to the Romans: (1.) As the first of the New Testament Epistles; (2.) in the group of the Pauline Epistles; (3.) as an original record of the missionary activity of the Apostle, and as an example for evangelical missions; (4.) as the central point of the Christian doctrine of salvation, and thus as the starting-point of the Western (Latin) Church, and especially of the Protestant Evangelical Church (see the *Introduction*).

3. The epistolary inscription of ancient writers contrasted with the subscription of recent ones. The former characterizes the Epistle as a substitute for personal intercourse; the latter has become an independent form of personal communication. Frankness predominates in the former, courtesy in the latter.

4. *Servant of Jesus Christ*, called *to be an apostle*. The extent of one idea is determined by that of the other.—*Gospel of God:* glorious unity.—Connection of the Old and New Testaments.—The apostles, unlike the Pharisees, acknowledge no traditions in connection with the Old Testament.—Grace and office must not be separated.—Just as little can we separate the experience of God's love and the beginning of sanctification.—Neither can grace and peace be separated; nor the paternal authority of God and the authority of Christ.

5. The importance of the inscription of this Epistle. The importance of the salutation. The adaptation of the great Apostle of the Gentiles and of the Christian congregation of the great metropolis to each other. See the *Exeg. Notes*.

6. The antithesis: Christ born of the seed of David, and *appointed the Son of God in majesty and honor* (also over the Roman world), is an economical antithesis, at the foundation of which lies the ontological antithesis: that Christ is the temporal Son of David and the eternal Son of God.

7. The resurrection was historically accomplished and essentially finished in Christ. As the ideal and dynamical productive energy of the Logos, its roots and impulse pervade the whole history of the world and of man, and especially the history of the kingdom of God. The same may be said of the Spirit of holiness. See the *Exeg. Notes*. The Logos lighteth every man that cometh into the world (John i. 9).

8. Paul, as the ambassador of Jesus Christ, the Son of God in regal power, announces to the believers of the imperial city of Rome that it is his business to call the world to obedience to the faith and to subjection to Christ

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

An apostolic salutation: 1. From whom does it come? 2. what is its import? 3. to whom is it addressed? (vers. 1-7).—The *one* gospel of God: 1. Promised by His prophets; 2. fulfilled by His Son (vers. 3, 4).—The missionary preaching among the Gentiles was a preaching of obedience to the faith for the glorifying of the name of Jesus Christ (ver. 5).—Every office is a gift of grace. The servants of Christ must remember this: 1. For their humility; 2. for their elevation and encouragement (ver. 5).—How can preachers of the gospel guard against bitterness toward the members of their congregation? By considering that the congregation are: 1. Beloved by God; 2. called by Jesus Christ (ver. 7).—*Grace* and *peace:* on *one* side different in manifestation, but, on the *other*, one in origin.

LUTHER:—The Spirit of God was given after Christ's ascension, since which time He sanctifies Christians and glorifies Christ in all the world as the Son of God in power, in word, miracle, and sign (ver. 4).

STARKE:—The preachers of the gospel must preach both the law and the gospel in their respective order, and especially the gospel (ver. 1).—He who does not become a saint on earth, will not be numbered among the saints in heaven (ver. 7).

QUESNEL:—Every thing that comes to light is not therefore new: the oldest errors are continual novelties, and the newest truths are ever old.

OSIANDRI *Bibl.*:—Christ, according to His human nature, is our brother. O great consolation! (ver. 3).

CRAMER:—Worldly peace is a great treasure, but, after all, it is not sufficient for us. When Christ communicates His peace to us (John xiv. 27), it is grace in God; and then have we peace with God (ver. 7).

BENGEL: The Gospel of God is also the Gospel of Christ (ver. 1).—*Jesus Christ is the Son of God* (vers. 3, 4). This is the ground of all legitimate address of Christ to His Father and God, and of our legitimate address, through Him as our Lord, to His Father and our Father, His God and our God, who hath made us His own. He was Son of God before His humiliation; but His Sonship was veiled during His earthly life, and not fully unveiled till after His resurrection. On this rests His justification, 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 John ii. 1, and this is the ground of our justification, Rom. iv. 25.

GERLACH:—According to the flesh, the Son of God belonged to the Jews alone. But by the completion of His atonement, through the resurrection, He became the universal King of the human race, Lord of heaven and earth, according to the Spirit which dwelt in Him, and has perfectly pervaded His human nature (vers. 3, 4).

HEUBNER:—Prophets and apostles had one calling, one work (ver. 2).—The apostolic benediction—of what fulness of spiritual gifts, of what a holy heart, does it give witness! It is grand to express such a wish for a church; it presupposes the personal possession and appreciation of these gifts, but also a serious zeal to apply them to the congregation (ver. 7).

ROOS:—If the theme of Paul's preaching had been only virtue, and a supreme Being whom we call God, he would have pleased the Greeks; and if he had preached on a Messiah yet to come and on

the works of the law, the Jews would have been contented with him. But he preached on the Son of God. That was the voice of his gospel (ver. 4).

BESSER:—The Spirit of holiness is the very force by which Christ has taken away the power of death, and has destroyed mortality, through the triumph of His imperishable life (ver 4).

J. P. LANGE:—How Christ exhibits His power as Lord by the Spirit of sanctification: 1. As the Risen One; 2. as the Son of God (vers. 1-4).—*The same:* Like man, like salutation.—The joy with which the Apostle announces the majesty of Christ in imperial Rome: 1. How foolish this joy appeared; 2. how gloriously it was justified; 3. how it must be fulfilled once more.—The internal connection between the power of the resurrection and the Spirit of holiness in Christ.

[BURKITT:—Paul declares: 1. The person from whom he received authority to be an apostle, namely, Christ; 2. how free and undeserved a favor it was; 3. the special duty and office of an apostle; 4. how he puts the Romans in mind of their condition by nature before the gospel was revealed to them and received by them; hence it is the duty of both ministers and people to be mindful of what was their condition by nature.—*Why is the Holy Ghost excluded in the salutation of ver. 7?* He is not excluded, though He be not named; but is necessarily implied in the forementioned gifts. Besides, in other salutations the Holy Ghost is expressly mentioned; 1 Cor. xiii. 13, 14.—HENRY:—The Apostle describes: 1. The person who writes the Epistle; 2. the gospel itself; 3. the persons to whom it is written; and 4. pronounces the apostolic benediction.—DODDRIDGE:—We are called to partake of the privileges of God's people; we belong to the society of those who are eminently beloved of God, and who lie under great obligations, as they are called a holy nation, a peculiar people. May we not dishonor the sacred community to which we belong, and may we finally enjoy the important privileges of that state of everlasting glory in which the kingdom of the Son of God shall terminate!—CLARKE:—The Apostle invokes upon the Romans all the blessings which can flow from God as the fountain of grace; producing in them all the happiness which a heart filled with the peace of God can possess; all of which are to be communicated to them through the Lord Jesus Christ.—*Comprehensive Comm.:*—The Christian profession is not a notional knowledge, or a naked assent, or useless disputings; but it is obedience to the faith. The act of faith is the obedience of the understanding to God revealing, and the product of that is the obedience of the will to God commanding.—BARNES:—From Paul's connecting the Lord Jesus Christ with the Father, we see: 1. That the Apostle regarded Him as the source of grace and peace as really as he did the Father; 2. he introduced them in the same connection, and with reference to the bestowal of the same blessings; 3. if the mention of the Father implies a prayer, the same is implied by the mention of Christ, and hence was an act of worship to the latter; 4. all this shows that Paul's mind was *familiarized* to the idea that Christ was divine.—These seven verses are a striking instance of the manner of Paul. While the subject is simply a salutation to the Roman church, his mind seems to catch fire, and to burn and blaze with signal intensity. He leaves the immediate subject before him, and advances some vast thought that awes us, and fixes us in contemplation, and involves us in difficulty about his meaning, and then returns to his subject.—HODGE:—God is called our Father, not merely as the author of our existence and the source of every blessing, but especially as reconciled toward us through Jesus Christ.—If Jesus Christ is the great subject of the gospel, it is evident that we cannot have right views of the one without having correct opinions concerning the other.—J. F. H.]

[SCHAFF:—The epistolary addresses generally bear on the doctrine of the ministerial office and its relation to the congregation, and furnish suitable texts for *ordination* and *installation* sermons.—Ver. 1. PAUL, a model for a Christian minister: I. In his *humility*—a SERVANT (bondsman) of Jesus Christ. II. In his *dignity*—a chosen APOSTLE. His sense of *dependence* on Christ (servant) precedes and underlies his sense of *authority* over the congregation (apostle).—Only the true servant of Christ can be a true servant of the people.—Ministers derive their authority from Christ, not *from* the people, but *for* the people.—A SERVANT OF CHRIST. The service of Christ is perfect freedom, John viii. 36. St. Augustine: "*Deo servire vera libertas est.*"—A CHOSEN APOSTLE. The apostle and the ordinary minister: I. The *unity:* (*a.*) Both are called by God; (*b.*) both are servants of Christ; (*c.*) both labor for the same end —the glory of God and the salvation of souls. II. The *difference:* (*a.*) An apostle is called *directly* by Christ; a minister, through the medium of church authority; (*b.*) an apostle is *inspired* and *infallible;* a minister is only enlightened, and liable to err; (*c.*) an apostle has the world for his field; a minister is confined to a particular charge.—CHOSEN, SET APART. The necessity of a Divine call for the ministry: I. The *inner* call by the Holy Ghost. II. The *outward* call by the authority and ordination of the Church.—The regularly called minister contrasted with the self-constituted minister and fanatic.—SET APART UNTO THE GOSPEL. The preaching of the gospel: I. The chief duty of the minister, to which all others must be subordinated. II. The highest work, in which Christ Himself and all the apostles engaged. III. The inconsistency of connecting any secular calling with the holy ministry.—Ver. 2. The close connection of the Old and New Testaments. Christianity a new, and yet an old religion.—The *historical* character of Christianity—in opposition to the Gnostic and fanatical theory of a magical, abrupt descent from the clouds.—Vers. 3, 4. JESUS CHRIST the great theme of the gospel. His double nature, the human, earthly, historical, and the divine, heavenly, eternal—both inseparably united in one person.—The importance of the RESURRECTION as an argument for the Divinity of Christ.—Ver. 5. Christ, the mediator of all grace.—Ver. 7. The Christians are SAINTS—*i. e.*, separated from the world and consecrated to the service of God; holy in principle, and destined to become more and more holy and perfect in their whole life and conduct.—The redeeming GRACE of God in Christ—the fountain of PEACE with God and with ourselves.—First grace, then peace.—No grace without peace; no peace without grace.—The coördination of Christ with God the Father in the epistolary inscriptions—an indirect proof of the Deity of Christ.]

II.

The Introduction.

Chap. I. 8–15.

8 First [of all],[1] I thank my God through Jesus Christ for [concerning][2] you
all, that your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world [in all the world].
9 For God is my witness, whom I serve with [in] my spirit in the gospel of his
Son, that [how, ὡς][3] without ceasing I make mention of you [how unceasingly
10 I remember you;] always in my prayers; Making request, [; always asking in
my prayers,][4] if by any means now at length [if haply now at last][5] I might
have a prosperous journey [I may be prospered][6] by the will of God to come
11 unto you. For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you [share with you,
μεταδῶ] some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established [in order that ye
12 may be strengthened];[7] That is, that I may be comforted together with you,
by the mutual faith both of you and me [among you by each other's faith, both
13 yours and mine].[8] Now [But] I would not[9] have you ignorant, brethren, that
oftentimes [often] I purposed to come unto you (but was let[10] [hindered]
hitherto)[11] that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other
14 Gentiles [the rest of the Gentiles]. I am debtor both to the Greeks, and to the
Barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise [Both to Greeks and to Barba-
15 rians; both to wise and to unwise, I am debtor]. So,[12] as much as in me is [as
far as lies in me], I am ready[13] to preach the gospel to you [also] that [who] are
at Rome also [*omit* also].

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 8.—[πρῶτον μέν, *primum quidem*, *zuvörderst*, *first of all*. The εἶτα δέ is omitted in the pressure ot though and flow of speech, as in Acts i. 1; Rom. iii. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 18. Comp. Winer, *Grammar*, p. 506 (6th ed), and Alex. Buttmann, *Grammatik des N. T. Sprachgebrauchs*, p. 313. Alford finds the corresponding δέ in ver. 13, and connects thus: "Ye indeed are prospering in the faith; but I still am anxious *further* to advance that fruitfulness." But this anxiety was already expressed in ver. 10, and the δέ in ver. 13 is simply μεταβατικόν.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 8.—περί is best supported in opposition to ὑπέρ. [The prepositions περί and ὑπέρ both occur in this connection (1 Cor. i. 4; Col. i. 3; 1 Thess. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 3), though ὑπέρ more rarely (Eph. i. 16; Phil. i. 4), with substantially the same meaning; the difference is, that περί, *concerning*, implies simply that the Roman Christians are the *subject* of thanks; while ὑπέρ, *for*, *in behalf of*, *for the sake of*, gives the idea of intercession and aid. But περί has also the latter meaning. They are often confounded by the MSS., but the best codices (ℵ. A. B. C. D*. K.) and critical editors (Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth) are here in favor of περί against the ὑπέρ of the *textus receptus*.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 9.—[ὡς differs from ὅτι and expresses the mode or degree. Comp. Phil. i. 8; 2 Cor. vii. 15; 1 Thess. ii. 10; Acts x. 28, and Meyer and Philippi *in loc.*—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 10.—[The translation depends here upon the punctuation, which is left to critical conjecture, the ancient MSS. having no punctuation. I make a comma or semi-colon after ποιοῦμαι, and connect πάντοτε, κ.τ.λ., with δεόμενος. So Meyer, Philippi, Alford (in his notes). Dr. Lange, however, in his version and *Exeg. Notes*, follows Tischendorf, who makes a comma after προσευχῶν μου, like the E. V. In this case πάντοτε must be taken as an intensification of ἀδιαλείπτως = *assidue semper*, *assiduissime*; but this would require a different position of the words, viz., ὡς ἀδιαλείπτως πάντοτε, κ.τ.λ. As it is, πάντοτε ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου δεόμενος is better taken as an explanation of ἀδιαλείπτως μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμαι, so as to mark at the same time a progress of the idea, the incessant remembrance of the Romans culminating in direct prayer.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 10.—[εἴ πως ἤδη ποτέ, *ob etwa endlich einmal* (Meyer, Olshausen, Lange, &c.); Alford: *if by any means before long*. πως, *haply*, *possibly*, implies the possibility of new delays and hindrances. ἤδη, *already*, may mean *finally* or *at last*, with reference to things long hoped for and delayed, and in connection with ποτε, *tandem aliquando*. See Hartung, *Partikellehre* i. 238. The Apostle's desire in this respect was granted about three years afterwards, A. D. 61.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 10.—[Or *succeed*, εὐοδωθήσομαι. The original meaning of ὁδός, *way*, *journey*, is lost in the verb. See *Exeg. Notes*. But the parting wish in Greece to travellers is even now καλὸν κατευόδιον, as in Italy, *buon viaggio*, *a happy journey*.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 11.—[Dr. Lange inserts after *gift: personal, peculiar grace*, and after *established: for your world-historical calling*. See his explanation below, which I cannot adopt.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 12.—[συμπαρακληθῆναι ἐν ὑμῖν διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πίστεως, ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ. The infinitive συμπαρακλ. (which compound verb only occurs here in the N. T.) is parallel with the preceding στηριχθῆναι, the subject ἐμέ being understood from ἐπιποθῶ, ver. 11. The συμ is generally resolved into ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐμαυτόν, *you and I*, but Meyer, on account of ἐν ὑμῖν, makes Paul the only subject of συμπαρακληθῆναι. This would require the omission of *together* in the E. V. The ὑμῶν (which is politely put first) and ἐμοῦ explain ἐν ἀλλήλοις, which is a little more emphatic than ἀλλήλων, showing that faith dwelled in the hearts of the Roman Christians. The *mutual faith* of the E. V. suggests the wrong sense *faith which each has in the other*. Dr. Lange, in accordance with his specific interpretation of χάρισμα, adds to *comforted: made joyful for the common call for the conversion of the world*.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 13.—[For οὐ θέλω, Codd. D*. E. G. and Ital. read οὐκ οἴομαι.—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 13.—[The verb *to let*, is used here, and 2 Thess. ii. 7, by the E. V. in the rare sense *to hinder*, *to forbid*, *to prevent* (κωλύειν, κατέχειν), as in Tennyson's lines:

"Mine ancient wound is hardly whole,
And *lets* me from the saddle."

But the word is now generally used in the opposite sense, *to allow*, *to permit*. On the contrary, the verb *to prevent*, in the E. V. (and in the Anglican Liturgy), means *to precede*, *to anticipate* (*præ-venire*); while in modern English it signifies the reverse, *to hinder*, *to obstruct*.—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 13.—[The words καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, are a parenthesis, since ἵνα must depend upon προεθέμην, &c It is not necessary on this account to take καί in the adversative sense, to which Fritzsche and Meyer object. δεῦρο is only here in the N. T. a particle of time, although often in Plato and later writers.—P. S.]

[12] Ver. 15.—[Or: *And so, Hence.* The force of οὕτως is: Since I am a debtor to all the Gentiles, &c.—P. S.]

[13] Ver. 15.—[οὕτως τὸ, κατ' ἐμὲ, πρόθυμον (sc. ἐστι). On the different interpretations of this phrase which do not materially alter the sense, comp. *Exeg. Notes.* As may be inferred from my punctuation, I connect (with the E. V., Calvin, Philippi, Wordsworth, Meyer, in his *last* edition) τό with πρόθυμον, and take πρόθυμον as equivalent to the substantive προθυμία (as τὸ χρηστόν for ἡ χρηστότης, ii. 4; comp. τὸ μωρόν, τὸ ἀσθενές, 1 Cor. i. 25), and as the subject of the sentence: *This being so* (οὕτως), *there is, on my part,* or, *as far as I am concerned* (κατ' ἐμέ, *quantum ad me*), *a willingness* or *desire* (πρόθυμον); or *I, as much as in me is, am willing* (Calvin: *Itaque, quantum in me est, paratus sum*). Comp. τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν, Eph. i. 15; τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν, Acts xiii. 28; 1 Cor. iii. 3; xv. 32). κατ' ἐμέ is more expressive than μου (after πρόθυμον) would be; the Apostle laying stress on his dependence and submission to a higher power, as if to say: As far as it depends on me, I am anxious to come and preach to you, but my will is subject to the will of God, who may have decreed otherwise.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

SECOND SECTION.—*The connecting link in the form of doxology, and the transition of the author to his designed argument in the fundamental topic. The praise of the faith of the Roman Christians known all over the world, and the desire and purpose of the Apostle to visit them.*

Ver. 8. **First of all, I thank.**—De Wette: "In all his Epistles, with the exception of Galatians, 1 Tim., and Titus,* the Apostle pursues the natural course of first placing himself, so to speak, in relation with his readers; and his first point of contact with them is gratitude for their participation in Christianity." [So also Alford *in loc*]. Comp. also 1 Thess. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 3; 1 Cor. i. 4. This means more definitely that the Apostle, in his epistles, with thanksgiving to God, seizes the point of connection for his subsequent argument; and this point of connection is in general a recognition of what has been already attained, but it takes its peculiar form from the conditon of the different churches. Köllner calls this, *captatio benevolentiæ.* Tholuck: The Apostle opens his way to the hearts of the church by a declaration of his love. [Wordsworth: "As usual, the Apostle begins with a sentiment by which he expresses his gratitude to God, and conciliates the good will of those to whom he writes."—P. S.] According to Tholuck [De Wette] and Meyer, we would properly expect an εἶτα δέ [or ἔπειτα δέ] after πρῶτον μέν, but not in point of fact, since the πρῶτον marks the emphasis of the following introductory word.—**My God.** Not only the expression of genuine feeling (De Wette), but also of the thought that God has shown Himself as the God of his apostolic call, by opening before him a path in Rome for the cause of Christ (Acts xxviii. 15). [The language of personal application, with a corresponding sense of personal obligation: the God who, with all His blessings and promises, belongs to me, as I belong to Him, and am bound to serve Him. Comp. Acts xxvii. 23: τοῦ θεοῦ οὗ εἰμι, ᾧ καὶ λατρεύω, 1 Cor. i. 4; Phil. i. 3; iv. 19; Philemon 4.—P. S.]—**Through Jesus Christ.** [Not to be connected with μου (Koppe, Glöckler), but with εὐχαριστῶ.—P. S.] Comp. Rom. vii. 25; Col. iii. 17; Heb. xiii. 15; 1 Peter ii. 5. Origen: Christ, as the mediator of the prayer, also presents the thanksgiving. [" *Velut per pontificem magnum: opportet enim scire eum qui vult offerre sacrificium Deo, quod per manus Pontificis debet offerre.*" So also Calvin, who refers to Heb. xiii. 15, Bengel, Olshausen, and Hodge, who justly says that it is the clear doctrine of the Bible that, in all our approaches to God in prayer or praise, we must come in the name of Christ as the ground of our acceptance.—P. S.] Meyer objects to this view as not justified by Paul's usual method, and explains that he renders thanks for what has come to pass by Christ. [Similarly Alford.] But what is meant by giving thanks for every thing in the name of Jesus Christ? (Eph. v. 20.) The thanksgiving, as well as prayer, must be sanctified by the spiritual communion with Christ, and thus come before God; by this means, all selfish interests, and all human and passionate joy at the obtained results are excluded.—**For you all.** The περί and ὑπέρ were often confounded or changed by the copyists; therefore the *Recepta* has ὑπέρ here. Here, as at the beginning of ver. 7, the Apostle emphasizes the fact that he has in view all the believers in Rome, and will not appeal to or favor any partisan tendency.—**That your faith is spoken of.** Mention is made of it, and it has become famous among Christians in the whole world (see chap. x. 18; xvi. 19). The expression, which has the outward appearance of being hyperbolical, acquires its complete significance chiefly in consequence of the powerful position of the metropolis of Rome, by the weight which Christianity gained in all the world by the conquest of this central home of the world, and by the Apostle's views of the future of this apostolic station. See the quotations from Grotius and Calvin in Tholuck. [Meyer: "ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ—a popular hyperbole, but admirably suited to the position of the congregation in the metropolis of the world, to which the eyes of all were directed." Remember the adage: *Orbis in urbe continetur.*—P. S.]

Ver. 9. **For God is my witness.** The *for* establishes the foregoing. Here, therefore, the thanksgiving through Christ is also explained (Phil. i. 3; Col. i. 3; 1 Thess. i. 2). The sense of the solemn asseveration is: My declaration is before the face of God. The free asseverations of this character arise in the Apostle's case from the inner character of his work and the loftiness of his position. He cannot adduce earthly witnesses of the peculiarity of the facts which he has to assure; they are of heavenly origin, and he calls on God as their witness: that is, his whole knowledge of God, and his apostolic conscience, must be pledged. Pareus: "*Ignotus ad ignotos scribens jurat.*" Against this, Meyer quotes Phil. i. 18 [and 2 Cor. i. 23.—P. S.] as decisive. The necessities for such strong expressions of the fervent man were indeed very different; but one species of them is that adduced by Pareus The general constraint of the Apostle to let his readers sometimes look into the sanctity of his inner life, is secured by the solemn asseveration against all danger of profanation. Meyer adduces as a mo

* [1 Tim. is no exception, comp. 1 Tim. i. 13-17; nor is 2 Cor., as Olshausen thinks, for in 2 Cor. i. 3-22 we have an equivalent. The absence of the usual praise and thanksgiving in the Epistle to the Galatians, is to be explained by their apostasy from the simplicity of the gospel. P. S.]

tive "the strange fact that he, the Apostle to the Gentiles, had not yet become active in the church at Rome, although it belonged to his school." [Bengel: "A pious asseveration respecting a matter necessary and hidden from men, especially from those who were remote and unknown." Alford: "There could be no other witness to his practice in his secret prayers, but God: and as the assertion of a habit of incessantly praying for the Roman Christians, whom he had never seen, might seem to savor of an exaggerated expression of affection, he solemnly appeals to this only possible testimony. To the Ephesians, Philippians (see, however, Phil. i. 8), Colossians, Thessalonians, he gives the same assurance, but without the asseveration. The thus calling God to witness is no uncommon practice with Paul; see ref. in E. V." The Apostle's frequent appeal to God (2 Cor. i. 23; xi. 31; Phil. i. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 5, 10; Gal. i. 20) is a devout recognition of God's omniscience, and hence an act of worship. It disproves the literal interpretation of Matt. v. 33 ff., which prohibits perjury, and all useless and thoughtless swearing. Comp. Tholuck, *Die Berg-predigt*, p. 263 ff. (3d ed.).—P. S.]

Whom I serve in my spirit. The idea of the real service of God, which so powerfully pervades the Epistle to the Romans, first appears with the λατρεύω (see ver. 21; chap. ii. 22; iii. 25; v. 2; xii. 1; xv. 16; xvi. 25–27; comp. Acts vii. 7). As such a λατρεύων, he stands before God. But he serves Him *in his spirit;* that is, his priesthood is not merely external, but the living service of God by a spiritually awakened, vital, and steadfast consciousness.* Grotius and Reiche have found in the λατρ. an antithetical relation to the Jewish λατρεία in the law. Meyer thinks such an idea far-fetched. But we are rather of the opinion that the Apostle is still thinking of all external character of worship, and especially that of the heathen Romans. [Umbreit, approvingly quoted by Alford: "The Apostle means that he is an intelligent, true priest of his God, not in the temple, but in his spirit; not at the altar, but at the gospel of His Son." λατρεύειν (עָבַר) and λειτουργεῖν (שֵׁרֵת) are used in the Septuagint of the ministrations of the Jewish priesthood in the temple (comp. Luke i. 23; Heb. viii. 6; ix. 21), and in the New Testament applied to the Christian ministry, and to worship generally (Matt. iv. 10; Phil. ii. 17). The words ᾧ λατρεύω, &c., give additional force to his solemn asseveration, and attest its sincerity.—P. S.]—**In the gospel of his Son.** (Genitive of the object.) His spirit is the temple, the sphere of his service; the gospel of the Son of God in the great work of evangelization, is the substance and form of his service of God.—**How without ceasing.** Meyer: ὡς does not stand for ὅτι (as it is usually taken, even by Fritzsche), but expresses the mode (the degree). This *thanking without ceasing* is not only more precisely defined, but more exactly conditioned by what follows.

Ver. 10. **Always in my prayers.** His spiritual longing and striving are directed toward Rome; therefore he is ever (and everywhere. Bretschneider: *Ubicunque locorum et quovis tempore.* Luther: in all places) praying with his mind fixed on Rome. The thought is thus defined, if, with Tischendorf, we place a comma after προσευχῶν μου. We prefer this view to that of Meyer: *Always asking in my prayers.* [Comp. here my Textual Note ⁴ in defence of Meyer's punctuation.—P. S.] There was, during his prayers, an *unceasing* remembrance of the Romans (the ἐπί is the determination of the time or the occasion), and this became a specific and urgent prayer.—**If haply now at last I.** The expression declares at the same time the earnestness of the petition, and humble resignation.—**Might have a prosperous journey** [better: **may be prospered.**—P. S.] Meyer: "The active εὐοδοῦν seldom has the exact signification, *to lead well, expeditum iter præbere;* . . . but the passive never means *via recta incedere, expeditum iter habere*, but always [even in Prov. xvii. 8] metaphorically, *prospero successu gaudere.* [Meyer then quotes a number of passages.—P. S.] Therefore the explanation, which anyhow gives a trivial idea, *prospero itinere utar* (Vulgate, and others), must be rejected." [So also Alford.] Nevertheless, the choice of the word was suited to the allusion that the prosperity which the Apostle desired would consist in a successful journey to Rome; and we have sought to express this in the translation (*Wohlfahrt*). The affair is a subject of his prayerful solicitude, for it is not from selfishness, but only in accordance with God's will that he will come to Rome. (Schott connects the ἐν τ. θελ. τ. θεοῦ not with ἐλθεῖν, but with εὐοδωθήσομαι; but then the word would not seem to have been well chosen.)

Ver. 11. **For I long to see you,** Ἐπιποθῶ. Fritzsche: simply *cupio.* [Not VALDE or ARDENTER *cupio;* comp. 2 Cor. v. 2; for ἐπί does not intensify, but simply expresses the direction of the πόθος, which itself means strong desire. So also De Wette, Meyer, and Alford.—P. S.] Schott, πόθον ἔχω ἐπί. According to Schott, the **see you,** ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς, would indicate that Paul did not design to stay in Rome. But yet it constitutes an antithesis to the Epistle now about to be written.—**Some spiritual gift,** χάρισμα πνευματικόν. De Wette: χάρισμα is simply a gift, without special reference to Divine grace. [De Wette understands by it the παράκλησις, ver. 12, and is followed by Alford.—P. S.] But the word must be explained by Paul's use of language, especially by 1 Cor. xii. 4. The specific gift of Paul consists in his being the Apostle to the Gentiles; and without doubt this expression means not only that the Roman Church is to receive a general spiritual blessing from him, but shall also share in this special spiritual gift. [But such specific reference seems to be excluded by τι, nor was the apostolate of the Gentiles strictly communicable to a congregation. Hence I prefer, with Tholuck, Olshausen, and Philippi, to give χάρισμα a more general application: spiritual invigoration of the whole Christian life, πίστις, ἀγάπη, ἐλπίς, γνῶσις, &c. So Hodge: "Any increase of knowledge, of grace, or of power."—P. S.] The adjective πνευματικόν, especially in connection with χάρισμα, can only denote a spiritual quality of the gift which proceeds from the communion of the divine Spirit. ["Springing from the Spirit of God, and imparted to the spirit of man;" Alford]. The following explanations are one-sided: Miraculous gifts (Bengel, &c.); gifts of the human spiritual life (Köllner, &c.). The τι, **some,** expresses not only the Apostle's modesty

* [De Wette: "*Das innere lebendige Element und somit die Wahrhaftigkeit des Dienstes.*" Meyer: "*ἐν πνεύματί μου, in meinem höheren sittlichen Selbstbewusstsein, welches die lebensvolle innere Werkstätte dieses Dienstes ist.*" On the spiritual service of God, comp. John iv. 24.—P. S.]

(Meyer), but an acknowledgment that the Romans were already in the faith, together with an intimation that something was still wanting in them.—**In order that ye may be strengthened** (see chap. xvi. 25). This is the object of the charismatic communication. [Paul uses the passive στηριχθῆναι, since he is simply the instrument through which God Himself strengthens and invigorates the spiritual life in man; comp. xvi. 25: τῷ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι, and 2 Thess. ii. 17.—P. S.]

Ver. 12. **That is, that I may be comforted together with you, &c.** The connection of the two objects serves to explain one as well as the other. The Apostle wishes that the Romans be strengthened by him (the choice of the passive is not merely an expression of modesty, but also of the information that the matter is not of human choice, but that the blessing must come from the Lord), not only in their faith in general, but also in their particular calling as Roman Christians in their central relation to the world. And the result therefrom will be, that the Apostle will be encouraged and aided in his universal apostleship. *The addition*, **that is**, &c., is therefore not a *sancta adulatio* (Erasmus), nor a safeguard against the appearance of presumption (Meyer),* but the statement of his whole purpose. This purpose is not to seek comfort and consolation among them, as the συμπαρακληθῆναι (ἅπαξ λεγόμενον in the New Testament) is explained by many, in harmony with the Peshito and Vulgate; but he will find Christian encouragement among them when they are strengthened (Meyer). Yet this is not only "in general," but with a view to his Western mission. The συμ does not include the readers (Fritzsche), but is related as a termination to the στηριχθῆναι of the Romans. This can be seen by the following: **By our common (reciprocal) faith, both yours and mine.** This is a brief form of expression (Reiche, Van Hengel, and others, supply the ἐν ἀλλήλοις with an ἐνεργουμένης). He declares the fact that the communion of faith should serve for the reciprocal promotion of the faith. Fritzsche and Schott miss ἐμέ, but this is implied in the words of the first person in ver. 11.

Ver. 13. **But I would not have you ignorant.** Well-known form of announcement, especially of something new and important (chap. xi. 25; 1 Cor. x. 1; 1 Thess. iv. 13).—**That oftentimes I purposed, &c.** Together with the Apostle's other impediments, it is of special consideration that, after every missionary journey, he found it necessary to return to Jerusalem in order to establish the unity of his new congregation with the mother church. Many delays were occasioned also by the necessary inspection and review of his organized churches, their internal disturbances, and the persecutions on the part of the Jews. The fact that he desired first to establish his mission in the East, he could not call an impediment. Meyer points to chap. xv. 22. [So does Alford.] But the Apostle seems to intimate here (according to vers. 20, 21) that he must prepare the church at Rome, as a church already existing, for his visit (by sending out his friends in advance). Meyer's remark is odd: "Therefore hindered neither by the devil (1 Thess. ii. 18), nor by the Holy Ghost (Acts xvi. 6);" for his general hinderance is specified in these terms.—**That I might have some fruit.** Harvest-fruit, as a laborer. The figure is frequent (Phil. i. 22; [John iv. 36; xv. 16; Col. i. 6. The "fruit" is not the result of Paul's labor, or his reward, but the good works of the Roman Christians who have been planted to bring forth fruit to God. This fruit the Apostle expected to gather and to present to God. Alford.—P. S.]. The choice of the expression is evidently a new evidence of his delicacy and modesty. We cannot urge that σχῶ is the antithesis of *have* (Meyer: *gehabt hätte*) and *obtain* (Köllner).—**Among you also.** The καί intensifies the comparison, in lively expression. The expression, ἔθνη, is used here to indicate definitely the Gentiles; first, because the Romans, as Romans, are Gentiles, from whom the remaining Gentiles are distinguished as such; then, because he has hitherto labored as the Apostle to the Gentiles. See the *Exeg. Note* on ver. 14. Schott: "There runs, from vers. 11–13, this thought: The Apostle Paul, in preparing himself for apostolic preaching in the midst of the Western Gentile world, regards it necessary to secure the Roman Church as a point of support and departure—so to speak, as a base of operations." While this opinion is correct enough as far as the definiteness of his aim is concerned, the Apostle was far from regarding Rome merely as the means for an end, without first having chiefly in view the purpose of edifying the Roman Church for its own sake.

Ver. 14. **To Greeks and to Barbarians.** What is the desire of his heart and his effort, is at the same time his calling and the duty of his office. His apostleship belongs to the whole Gentile world, and for this reason incidentally also to the Jews. Therefore, in consequence of the existing unity of Grecian and Roman culture, the Greeks and the Romans are combined under the term Greeks, in antithesis to the so-called Barbarians (Cicero, *De Fin.* ii. 15: *Non solum Græcia et Italia, sed etiam omnis barbaria*), just as the term *wise* comprehends Jews and Greeks (1 Cor. i. 26), and the *unwise* those barbarian nations who stood lowest in intellectual culture.* The antithesis of Greeks and Barbarians means, according to the original Greek usage, Greeks and non-Greeks—the latter as uncultivated Barbarians in a national sense. It is in this sense that the present passage is interpreted by Reiche and others. But at a time when Greek was written in Rome, and to Rome, the word undoubtedly indicated an historical antithesis of culture, according to the expression quoted from Cicero; and Paul, with his refined feeling, could hardly have chosen the word in the former restricted sense. (Ambrosiaster, and others.) Meyer objects that the Romans were nowhere enumerated as Hellenes. But this is certainly the case in ver. 16, where the Hellene represents heathendom in general. Comp. chap. ii. 9, 10; x. 12; and the many antitheses of a similar

* [So also Wordsworth, who explains τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν: 'Think not that I am so presumptuous as to imagine that the benefit will be wholly yours.'—P. S.]

* [Βάρβαρος—an onomatopoëtic word imitating a rough sounding, unintelligible language—means originally simply a foreigner, a man speaking a strange tongue (1 Cor. xiv. 11; comp. Ovid's "*Barbarus hic ergo sum, quia non intelligor ulli*"), and does not necessarily imply reproach, but the Greeks, with their pride of race and culture, and the Romans, with their pride of power, looked down with sovereign contempt upon all other nations. *Hellen and Barbarian* refers to the distinction of language and race; *wise and unwise*, to the difference of natural intelligence and culture in every nation. Rome, being "an epitome of the world," included representatives of all nations and all shades of culture and ignorance. The Jews should not be mixed in here; the Apostle speaks simply of his indebtedness to the whole Gentile world without distinction of race and culture.—P. S.]

character in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the other Pauline Epistles. Therefore Meyer's statement is unsatisfactory, that Paul would only express his Gentile-apostolic obligation in its universality, and that he does this in double *merismatic* form, as well according to nationality as according to the degree of culture. The sense certainly is, that he is pledged to all Gentiles. In this relation, he is ὀφειλέτης in the sense of *indebtedness*, which he assumed at his call. See 1 Cor. ix. 10.*

Ver. 15. **So, as far as lies in me, I am ready.** So far as it depends on him, he is not only willing, but determined; his inclination corresponds to his indebtedness (*πρόθυμον* = *προθυμία*). *τὸ κατ' ἐμέ* is variously explained. 1. *Οὕτως, τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ: πρόθυμον* (*sc. προθυμία ἐστι*). 2. *Οὕτως τὸ* (*κατ' ἐμὲ*) *πρόθυμον.* 3. *Οὕτως τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον* (= *τὸ πρόθυμόν μου*). 4. *Οὕτως: τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον.* De Wette and also Meyer [in the third edition of 1859, but not in the fourth. —P. S.] are for the first: As far as I am concerned, there is readiness. [This explanation connects *τὸ* with *κατ' ἐμέ*, and takes *πρόθυμον* as the predicate and a substantive = *προθυμία*.—P. S.] Reiche [Calvin, Philippi, Van Hengel, and Meyer, in the fourth edition of 1865, where he gives up his former view.—P. S.] are for the second: And so am I —as far as lies in me—ready. Fritzsche is for the third: *My* readiness, or desire, is. [*κατ' ἐμέ* in this case is taken as a mere periphrase for *ἐμοῦ*, but it has an emphasis, and expresses Paul's sense of dependence on a higher will.—P. S.] Tholuck is for the fourth: So, for my part, I am ready. [Tholuck, though not very decidedly, follows Beza (*Quidquid in me situm est, id promptum est*), Grotius, Bengel, and Rückert, and takes *τὸ κατ' ἐμέ* as the subject of the sentence = *ἐγώ*, and *πρόθυμον* as an adjective and as the predicate: I am ready. But Meyer objects that *τὸ κατ' ἐμέ* is never used as a periphrase for the personal pronoun; *τὰ ὑμέτερα* for *ὑμεῖς*, and *τὰ ἐμά* for *ἐγώ* not being parallel.—P. S.] I think the explanation of Reiche the correct one.† For further particulars, see De Wette, Tholuck, and Meyer. Theodore Schott explains the *οὕτως*, *under such circumstances*, and translates thus: Under such circumstances it is my present inclination. But Paul has not at all spoken of circumstances. He asserts that *οὕτως*, used absolutely, never means *itaque*, but always "under this condition, these circumstances." But as the circumstances may be attending, so they may be causative; comp. Rom. v. 12.—**To you also who are in Rome.** Schott thinks that by these words are meant, not the Christians in Rome, but the Gentile inhabitants of Rome! The natural conclusion from this view would be, that his Epistle also must have been designed for the Gentiles in Rome. Certainly he had in view from the start, besides the Christians, those Gentiles also who were yet to be converted [*τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ* is emphatically added, since Rome, the "*caput et theatrum orbis terrarum*," could least of all be excluded from that general apostolic commission. Bengel and Meyer.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The point of connection (ver. 8). Every Pauline Epistle has its definite point of connection. So, too, has every apostolic sermon of Peter, Paul, and John. And this is as much a vital law for proper Christian preaching, as for missions. See the connecting point in Acts xvii. The doxological character of this section. Without gratitude for what is given, there is no real continuance, still less any real progress. Gratitude must also be sanctified by working in Christ.

2. Asseverations, prayers, proofs of the Apostle's prayer. See the *Exeg. Notes.*

3. The difference between the longing of the Apostle for Rome, and the longing of the modern world for Rome. If the Pauline Christianity of the Evangelical Church were not so much paralyzed by the indifference of humanitarianism, by the hatred and ignorance of rationalism, and by the morbid literalism of confessionalism and sectarianism, it would be able to wield the weapons of the Spirit as heroically against mediæval Papal Rome—which is now besieged at so many points—as Paul, the poor tent-maker, combatted pagan, imperial Rome. Still, the gospel of God will triumph in the end.

4. The great missionary thought of the Apostle (vers. 11, 12). See the *Exeg. Notes.* Ver. 12: The Popes do not write thus to the Romans.

5. The impediments (ver. 13). Although the Apostle knew well that on the absolute height of faith all impediments are only means of advancement for believers (Rom. viii. 28), he yet speaks of impediments with a truly human feeling. But each of these impediments marks a point where he surrenders to God his desire to pass beyond those sacred limits through which an enthusiast would have violently broken.

6. How Paul subsequently attained the object of his wishes, though not according to human purposes, but according to the counsel of God; first as a prisoner, and last as a martyr.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

How the Apostle introduces himself to the Church at Rome: 1. As remembering it in prayer (vers. 8–10); 2. as desiring its personal acquaintance (vers. 11, 12); 3. as previously prevented from visiting it and fulfilling his obligation (vers. 13–15). —The truly Christian manner of introducing one's self to strange people.—Praise without flattery (ver. 8).—Under what circumstances can we call on God to witness? 1. When we are conscious that we serve Him; 2. when the matter in hand is sacred (ver. 9).—We cannot always do what we would (vers. 11–13).—For what purpose should Christian friends visit each other? 1. To give; 2. to receive (vers. 11, 12).—Paul a debtor to the Greeks and to the Barbarians, to the wise and the unwise: 1. In what did his obligation consist? 2. when did he acknowledge it? 3. how did he desire to discharge it?

* [We mention, as an exegetical curiosity, that Dr. Wordsworth finds in this passage proof of the universal gift of language for preaching the gospel: "How could St. Paul be said to *owe the debt* of the gospel to *all the world*, if he had not the *means* of paying it? And how could he pay it, without the coinage of intelligible words?" It would be hard for Dr. Wordsworth to prove that Paul preached in the Chinese, the Sanscrit, the Teutonic, and Celtic languages, to nations who understood no other, and whom he never visited. From Acts xiv. 11, 14, it would seem that he did not understand the popular language of Lycaonia. The knowledge of Greek and Hebrew was sufficient for his apostolic mission within the limits of the whole Roman empire.—P. S.]

† [Comp. my Textual Note [12] on ver. 15, p. 68.—P. S.]

(vers. 14, 15).—The obligation of Christians to the heathen (ver. 14).

STARKE: We have greater occasion to thank God for spiritual than for temporal blessings (ver. 8).—We must not always be brief in prayer, but we must continue until the heart becomes warmed (ver. 10).—Complete sovereignty over auditors does not belong to any teacher or preacher (ver. 13).—QUESNEL: Thankfulness is one of the most excellent, but one of the most neglected duties. Preachers must supply this deficiency on the part of their flocks (ver. 8).—The oath may be allowed, if God's honor requires it (ver. 9).—CRAMER: The presence and living voice of teachers can accomplish more than the mere reading of their writings. Therefore Christians should not think that they have done enough, when they read God's word in sermons at home; but, whenever they can, they should hear their instructors personally, and industriously attend public worship (ver. 11).—OSIANDRI *Bibl.*: We should do no less than our calling directs; but we should not include therein any thing that does not belong to it, lest we trespass on the office of another (ver. 15).

LISCO, *on vers.* 9–12: The fruits of the (apostolical) sense of gratitude: (*a.*) Continual remembrance of the Roman Christians in prayer; (*b.*) prayer that, by the will of God (ver. 10), an open way might be made for his personal acquaintance with the church.

HEUBNER, *on ver.* 8: 1. There is an extended Christian celebrity in the estimation of others; yet it must not be sought nor circulated designedly, but come of itself; 2. we learn that Christian churches should take knowledge of each other. Metropolitan cities can exert an important influence on the whole country. So with Rome at that time.—*On ver.* 9: Sacred fidelity to one's calling is true service of God.

LANGE: The justification of praise: 1. So far as it corresponds to the truth; 2. is embraced in thanksgiving; 3. is sanctified as an incitement to greater success.—The estimation of good human conduct is not ignored by the exclusion of the merit of works, but secured against profanation.—Rome formerly a celebrated congregation of believers.—The different phases of Rome in universal history.—*The apostolical longing for Rome*: 1. An image of the longing of Christ (Luke xii. 49); 2. a life-picture of human destination.—The sanctification of longing.—The proper estimate of impediments in life: 1. We should distinguish between imaginary and real hinderances; 2. we should not become discouraged by them, but we should not stubbornly force our way through them; 3. we should overcome them by prayer; 4. we should transform them into helps. (The Epistle to the Romans, besides other blessings, arose from the Apostle's hinderances.)

[BURKITT: From the Apostle's longing to see the Romans, learn: 1. That the establishment in faith and holiness is needed by the holiest and best Christians; 2. that the presence of the ministers of Christ with their people is necessary for their establishment; 3. that the Apostle desired to be personally present with the Church and saints at Rome for his own benefit as well as for their advantage.—HENRY: Ver. 8. The faith of the Roman Christians came to be talked of because of the prominence of Rome. That city being very conspicuous, every thing done there was talked of. Thus, they who have many eyes upon them need to walk very circumspectly; for, whether they do good or evil, it will certainly be reported. How is the purity of Rome departed! The Epistle *to* the Romans is an argument *against* them.—SCOTT: The most of us must own with shame that we are not so earnest or particular, even in our narrow circles, as Paul was in respect to his most extensive connections and multiplied engagements. We ought to long for opportunities of usefulness, as worldly men do for a prosperous trade, or occasions of distinguishing themselves and acquiring celebrity.—CLARKE: Ver. 9. Paul presents the *spiritual* worship of God in opposition to the *external*. Our religion is not one of ceremonies, but one in which the life and power of the eternal Spirit are acknowledged and experienced.—BARNES: 1. One effect of religion is, to produce the desire of the communion of saints; 2. nothing is better fitted to produce growth in grace than such communion; 3. the firm faith of young converts is very much calculated to excite the feeling and strengthen the hope of Christian ministers; 4. the Apostle did not disdain to be taught by the humblest Christians.—J. F. H.]

III.

The Fundamental Theme.

CHAP. I. 16, 17.

16 For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ[1] [*omit* Christ]: for it is the
power of God [God's power] unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the
17 Jew first,[2] and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God
[God's righteousness] revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just
[The righteous] shall live by [of] faith (Hab. ii. 4).[3]

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 16.—The Codd. A. B. C. D., &c., read τὸ εὐαγγέλιον without the addition of τοῦ Χριστοῦ. [Cod. Sin. likewise omits τοῦ Χριστοῦ, as do nearly all the critical editors, Mill, Bengel, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, &c. The words are found in the Complutensian Text and in Elzevir, and are defended by Wetstein and Matthaei.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 17.—The πρῶτον is left out by Codd. B. and G. [not A., as Lange has it]; probably because it had an offensive appearance. [MSS. א. A. C. D. K. L. have it. Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, and others retain it. Lachmann puts it in brackets.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 17.—[This is a free translation of the Hebrew (Hab. ii. 4): וְצַדִּיק בֶּאֱמוּנָתוֹ יִחְיֶה, lit., the righteous shall live in (by) his faithfulness. The Masoretic accentuation, however, connects the first two words: The righteous in his faith, shall live. The Hebrew אֱמוּנָה and the Christian πίστις both rest on the fundamental idea of trust in God. Paul follows in his rendering the Septuagint, but properly omits the μου which these insert: ὁ δίκαιος μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται. Vulgate: *justus in fide sua vivet.* Most commentators connect ἐκ πίστεως with the verb ζήσεται. But Dr. Lange, with Beza and Meyer, connects ἐκ πίστεως with ὁ δίκαιος, and translates: He that is righteous by faith, shall live. See the *Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

THIRD SECTION.—*The fundamental theme. The joy of the Apostle to proclaim the gospel of Christ, since it is a power of God for Jews and Gentiles as a revelation of the righteousness of God—a righteousness by and for the faith.*

Ver. 16. **For I am not ashamed** [not even in the metropolis of the heathen world.—P. S.]. Evidently, this general declaration refers not merely to ver. 15, but also to ver. 14. There could be no difficulty to the Apostle to preach to the believers in Rome; but it was difficult to preach to the whole Gentile world, especially to its wise men, who were so much inclined to despise the gospel as foolishness. And finally, it was particularly difficult to preach to the Gentiles in the proud metropolis of Rome, the central seat of the culture and pride of the ancient world. It is plain from ver. 15, *you that are at Rome*, that he would not confine himself to the congregation of Christians in Rome. The designation of his disposition is exact in relation to that pride of wisdom which everywhere opposed him, as he had experienced particularly in Athens and Corinth. He is not *afraid* of the *threats* of the world; he does not *avoid* the *offence* of the Jews; nor is he *ashamed* in view of the *contempt* of the *Greeks* and of the *wise men*. And this is not only expressive of his real joy in general, but of his Christian enthusiasm, by which he could glory in the cross of Christ (Rom. v. 2; Gal. vi. 14). [*I am not ashamed*, is an answer, by anticipation, to an objection which was readily suggested by the word *Rome*, with all its associations of idolatry, worldly power, pride, pomp, corruption, decay, and approaching persecution of Christians. Tacitus, the heathen historian, says of Rome, that there *cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque* (*Annal.* xv. 44). See Chrysostom, Alford, Wordsworth, Hodge *in loc.* Meyer explains the term more with reference to the past experiences of Paul in other heathen cities, as Athens, Corinth, Ephesus, and to the general character of the religion of the cross (1 Cor. i. 18). It is true that human nature, as such, in its carnal pride, is apt to be ashamed of the gospel. But this carnal pride culminated at the time in Rome, and found a fit expression in the blasphemous worship of the emperors as present deities. That Paul has special reference to Rome, is also evident from his definition of the gospel as a *power* of God, which puts to shame the world-power of Rome (ῥώμη, strength). Dealing with the Greeks, who excelled in wisdom, he defines the gospel to be the *wisdom* of God, which turns the wisdom of this world into folly. When afterwards a prisoner in Rome, Paul was not ashamed of his bonds (2 Tim. i. 12), in which he felt more free, mighty, and happy than the emperor on the throne.—P. S.].

Of the gospel of Christ. Here, also, we cannot separate the concrete unity of the gospel and its promulgation.

For it is a power of God.* The *for* announces the reason: it is the highest manifestation of the power of God—the highest manifestation of the compassionate love and grace of God; it is the blessing of salvation for faith throughout the world. *The power of God.* This cannot apply to the preaching of the gospel alone, but to the objective gospel itself, which combines with evangelization for complete operation. The question whether there is a metonyme † here (see Tholuck), becomes important only when that unity is dissolved. The gospel, in the objective sense, implies: 1. The revelation of God in Christ; 2. redemption by Christ; 3. the victory, the glory, and the kingdom of Christ; 4. the presentation of this salvation through the medium of the Church in word and sacrament, under the operation of the Holy Spirit.‡

Unto salvation. Both the negative and positive sides of the idea of the σωτηρία must be elucidated, the former denoting redemption, the latter adoption. The operation of σωτηρία reaches from the depths of hell to heaven. When man is truly delivered, he is always delivered from the depths of hell, and raised to the heights of heaven; because he is saved from the condemnation of his conscience, and from the judgment of wrath, and is made a participant of salvation through the righteousness of faith which leads to righteousness of life. The expression, *blessedness*, denotes the highest effect and the highest aim of the σωτηρία. Comp. Acts iv. 12; xiii. 26; Rom. x. 1. The opposite is ἀπώλεια, θάνατος, and similar terms.

To every one that believeth. De Wette: "The παντί is opposed to Jewish particularism, and the πιστεύοντι to Jewish legalism." § The highest operation of God's power is not at all a fatalistic or mechanical operation; it is a personal dealing of love, and presupposes personal relations. For

* [To δύναμις θεοῦ, comp. 1 Cor. i. 24, where Christ is called θεοῦ δύναμις and θεοῦ σοφία.—P. S.]

† [*i. e.*, here *rei per instrumentum effectæ pro instrumento*, as if we say, the knife cuts, while it is the hand of man that cuts with the knife. So it is the Holy Spirit that operates through the gospel as the instrumentality.—P. S.]

‡ [δύναμις θεοῦ is not to be resolved into *divine power* (Jowett), but the gospel is a power in and through which God Himself works efficaciously, *i. e.*, so as to save the sinner by rousing him to repentance, faith, and obedience. θεοῦ is *gen. auctoris* or rather *possessivus.* Comp. 1 Cor. i. 18. Alford explains: "The bare substantive δύναμις here (and 1 Cor. i. 24) carries a *superlative* sense: the highest and holiest vehicle of the divine power, the δύναμις κατ' ἐξοχήν." Umbreit remarks that the law is never called God's power, but a light or teaching, in which man must walk.—P. S.]

§ [Or rather: *every one*, implies the *universality*; *that believeth*, the subjective *condition*, of the gospel salvation; *faith* being the apprehending and appropriating organ. Paul says not: to every one who is *circumcised*, or *baptized*, or *obeys the law*, but, to every one that *believeth*. Without faith, sacraments and good works avail nothing. But true saving faith is of course a living faith, including knowledge of the truth, assent to the truth, and trust or confidence in Christ; it submits to all the ordinances of Christ and necessarily produces good works.—P. S.]

as it cannot be said, on the one hand, that faith completes objective salvation, so we cannot say, on the other, that it is a compulsory operation of salvation. It is the condition of the efficacy of salvation (John iii. 16, &c.; see Gen. xv.), the *causa apprehendens*.

To the Jew first. This priority is *economical*, as it rests upon the Old Testament revelation of God, and the faith of Abraham (chap. iv. 9); and as such it is: 1. The *genetic* priority. "Salvation is of the Jews" [John iv. 22]. 2. The *historical* priority (Chrysostom, and others). 3. A *legal* priority (as to form) of the nearest claim to the gospel in accordance with the direction given to the apostles, Acts i. 8 (Calov, De Wette, Tholuck). But notwithstanding all this, the Jew had no real right to the gospel, since salvation, 1. is not a product of Judaism, but of free grace; 2. faith is older than Judaism (chap. iv.); 3. faith itself is the reality and substance of which Judaism was only the symbol.*

And also to the Greek. The Ἕλλην is here the representative of all who are not Jews. [*Jew* and *Greek* here refer not to the *national* distinction, as *Greek* and *Barbarian*, ver. 14, but to the *religious* antagonism of the world at the time, so that *Greek* is equivalent to *Gentile*. Ἑλλ. κ. Βάρβ. is the *Greek*, Ἰουδ. κ. Ἑλλ. the *Jewish*, designation of all mankind; comp. Acts xiv. 1; 1 Cor. x. 32.—P. S.]

Ver. 17. **For therein is the righteousness of God.** Proof of the previous proposition. The δύναμις θεοῦ εἰς σωτηρίαν is ἀποκάλυψις of the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, &c.

[Preliminary Philological Remarks on δικαιοσύνη and the Cognate Terms.—These are of primary importance in Paul's Epistles, especially the Romans and Galatians. Their root, according to Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* v. 2), is δίχα = twofold; hence δικάζειν, to divide into two equal parts, to judge; δικαστής, judge, dispenser of justice. Others derive them from δίκη (the daughter of Zeus and Themis), custom, right, judgment. At all events, the fundamental idea of δικαιοσύνη is an even relation between two or more parts where each has its due, or conformity to law and custom, a normal moral condition. According to Homer, he is δικαιότατος who best fulfils his duties to God and men. Plato develops the idea of righteousness in his *Politeia*, and identifies it with moral goodness. In the Bible, the will of God, as expressed in the written law, and more fully in the perfect life of Christ, is the standard both of morals and religion, which are always viewed as essentially connected. God Himself is righteous—*i. e.*, absolutely perfect in Himself, and in all His dealings with His creatures, and requires man to aim at this perfection (Matt. v. 48). Accordingly, we may define the several terms (referring to the dictionaries and concordances for passages) as follows:

δίκαιος, צַדִּיק, conform to the law, inwardly as well as outwardly, holy, perfect. It is used in the abcolute sense of God, in a relative sense of man, also of things. Du Cange: "*Δίκαιος dicitur vel de re vel de persona, in qua nec abundat aliquid nec deficit, quæ muneri suo par est, numeris suis absoluta.*"

δικαιοσύνη, צְדָקָה, *justitia*, the normal moral and religious condition. If used of man, it means conformity to the holy will and law of God, godliness, or true piety toward God, and virtue toward man. If used of God, it is one of His moral attributes, essentially identical with His holiness and goodness, as manifested in His dealings with His creatures, especially with men.

δικαιόω (λογίζειν εἰς δικαιοσύνην), הִצְדִּיק, *justificare*, to put right with the law, *i. e.*, to declare or pronounce one righteous, and to treat him accordingly. Etymologically, the word ought to mean, to *make* just (since the verbs in όω, derived from adjectives of the second declension, signify, to make a person or thing what the primitive denotes, as τυφλόω, δουλόω, ὀρθόω, φανερόω, τελειόω = τυφλόν, &c., ποιεῖν). But in Hebrew and Hellenistic, and often also in classical usage, it has a forensic sense, to which, however, when used of God, the objective state of things, either preceding or succeeding, must correspond, for God's judgment can never err, and His declaration is always effective. More of this, *ad* ii. 13 and iii. 21–31. Now for the particular explanation of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in our passage.

δικαίωσις (λογισμὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης) *justificatio*, the act of putting a man right with the law or into the state of δικαιοσύνη.

δικαίωμα, a righteous decree, judgment, ordinance.—P. S.]

In view of the widely divergent explanations, it is necessary to make close distinctions. The righteousness of God, understood absolutely in its complete New Testament revelation, or ἀποκάλυψις, cannot apply immediately to righteousness *before God* (ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ), in which case the genitive is taken objectively in a wider relation (thus Luther, Fritzsche, Baur, Philippi). For this righteousness of faith presupposes justification. Nor can the word of itself denote the act of justification, even if we connect with it the result, the *righteousness of faith*, the genitive being taken in this case subjectively* in this sense: "the rightness which proceeds from God, the right relation in which man is placed by a judicial act of God" (Meyer, after Chrysostom, Bengel, De Wette, and others).† For the justification presupposes the atonement (chap. iii. 25), and the atonement is founded on the exercise of God's righteousness. To this exercise the Apostle evidently refers in chap. iii. 25, 26, and he therefore does it here also in the theme, which, from its very nature, must encompass the whole idea of the Epistle. Absolute righteousness, like absolute grace and truth, is first revealed in Christianity. It is the righteousness which not only institutes the law of the letter, and requires righteousness in man, and, in its character of judge, pronounces sentence

* Alford: "Not that the Jew had any *preference* under the gospel; only he *inherits* and has a *precedence*." Wordsworth: "First, in having a prior claim, as the covenanted people of God: first, therefore, in the season of its offer, but not in the condition of its recipients *after* its acceptance." Dr. Hodge refers πρῶτον merely to the priority in time, which is not sufficient.—P. S.]

* [Or as genitive of origin and procession. See Meyer.—P. S.]

† [So also Alford: "God's righteousness—not His attribute of righteousness, 'the righteousness of God,' but righteousness *flowing from and acceptable to Him*." He then subjoins De Wette's note. Hodge: "The righteousness which God gives, and which He approves." He also quotes the remark of De Wette: "All interpretations which overlook the idea of imputation, as is done in the explanations given by the Romanists, and also in that of Grotius, are false." M. Stuart confounds δικαιοσύνη with δικαίωσις and explains: "δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is the justification which God bestows, or the justification of which God is the author."—P. S.]

and kills, but which at last reveals itself in union with love, or as grace in the form of righteousness, and *produces* righteousness in man. It accomplishes all this: 1. As law-giving—that is, establishing the right—it institutes the law of the Spirit; that is, it reveals it in the life of Christ as the personal power of the atonement. 2. In the power and suffering of this personal righteousness, it satisfies the demands of the righteousness of the law, and thus changes the symbolical *ἱλαστήριον* into a real one. The atonement. 3. It communicates to believers the work and efficacy of Christ's righteousness, by the spirit of His righteousness, as a gift of grace and principle of the new life in creative, operative justification.

Or briefly: The righteousness of God is the self-communication of the righteousness which proceeds from God, which becomes personal righteousness in the person of Christ, which, in His passion as propitiation, satisfies the righteousness of the law (in harmony with the requirement of conscience), and, by the act of justification, applies the atonement to the believer for the sanctification of his life.

As the *δόξα*, which avails before God, can be none other than the *δόξα*, which proceeds from God, and became personal in Christ, so can the righteousness which avails before God be none other than a righteousness which comes from God. It is the *δικαιοσύνη ἐκ θεοῦ*, in opposition to the *δικ. ἡ ἐμή*, Phil. iii. 9; and therefore the *δικαιοσύνη ἐνώπιον θεοῦ*, Rom. iii. 21, in opposition to the *δικαιοσύνη ἐκ τοῦ νόμου*, chap. x. 5. Therefore it is God's righteousness also in this sense, that man can never make out of it a righteousness of *his own*, though the Divine justification becomes the principle of his new life. Tholuck likewise allows a combination of the objective and subjective meanings, but decidedly rejects the interpretation of *δικαιοσύνη*, as an attribute of God, which he considers incompatible with the prophetic passage adduced. But this quotation does not explain righteousness, but faith. The statement of Tholuck, that Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, i. 625 f.) describes the *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* as an attribute of God, is not exact; he declares it only as a righteousness existing on the part of God.* We go so far as to understand by righteousness here a synthesis of righteousness and of love—a synthesis which, as grace according to its different relations under the supremacy of righteousness, and as the grace that establishes the new and the absolute right of the Spirit, is called righteousness, but which, under the supremacy of love, as the fountain of the new life, is called love. This impartial righteousness is revealed to believers as grace, and to unbelievers as wrath. When Tholuck says that *δικ.* is not the righteousness of God in fulfilment of the promises (Ambrose), nor retributive justice (Origen), nor the essential righteousness which belongs to God (as Osiander once taught, and recently Hofmann), nor the goodness of God (Morus), nor impartiality toward Jews and Gentiles (Semler), he has collected into one all the *disjecta membra* of the central idea, that the *δικαιοσύνη* (from *δίχα*, a relation between two, according to the Aristotelian derivation of the word), establishes, maintains, and restores the relation between the personal God and the personal world according to their respective character (for the protection of personality). The omission of the article does not justify us in reading here, *a righteousness of God*; being inseparably connected with *θεοῦ*, it means rather *the* proper righteousness of God (see Winer's *Gramm.*).*

[Upon the whole, I agree with this interpretation. The majority of evangelical commentators restrict the *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* to God's *justifying* righteousness; some even ungrammatically identify it with justification (*δικαίωσις*), or God's "method of justification." The fundamental idea of the Epistle as set forth in the theme, every expression used in vers. 16 and 17, and the contrast presented in ver. 18, point to a more comprehensive meaning, answering to the definition of the gospel as "the power of God unto salvation," full and final, from "all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." This implies a righteousness impartable as well as imputable, or sanctifying as well as justifying—a righteousness inherent in God, and manifested in Christ, which, by a living union with Christ, is to become the personal property and higher nature of the believer, so that, at the final judgment, no trace of unrighteousness will remain. Wordsworth (an Anglican) and Forbes (a Scotch Presbyterian LL.D.) independently arrive substantially at the same view with Lange. Wordsworth *in loco* says: "This significant phrase, *the righteousness of God*, is not to be lowered, weakened, and impaired, so as to mean only the *method of justification* by which God acquits and justifies mankind. But it is the very righteousness of God Himself, which is both imputed and imparted to men in Jesus Christ 'the Righteous' (John ii. 1), who is 'the Lord our righteousness' (Jer. xxiii 6; xxxiii. 16), and who, being God from everlasting, and having also taken the nature of man, is made righteousness to us (1 Cor. i. 30), and does effectually, by His incarnation, and by our incorporation into Him, justify us believing on Him, and making Him ours by faith, so that we may not only be acquitted by God, but may become the righteousness of God in Him (2 Cor. v. 21)." Forbes, in a long and able dissertation (*Anal. Com.*, p. 102 ff.), combines here the three Scripture meanings of *δικαιοσύνη*, when used of God, viz.: "1. God's *retributive* righteousness or justice (now manifested in God's condemnation of sin, shown in giving His Son to die for man's sin on the cross—to induce thereby the believer to concur cordially in its condemnation in himself); 2. God's *justifying* righteousness (now manifested in Christ's exhibiting in the character of man a perfect righteousness—imputable to and appropriable by the believer, for his pardon and acceptance with God); 3. God's *sanctifying* righteousness (also manifested in Christ as "the Lord our righteousness," changing the believer's heart the moment he is united by faith to Christ, and progressively mortifying within him all sin, and imparting eventually to him universal righteousness—appropriable in like manner through faith by the believer)." For further information, comp. the *Exeg*

* [Hofmann says, *l. c.*, p. 626: "*Einerseits bezeichnet δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ eine Gerechtigkeit, welche Gottes ist; andererseits muss nach dem Zusammenhange etwas gemeint sein, das uns zu Theil wird.*" He takes the word to mean, not an attribute of God, but a righteousness which God has established, and which constitutes the subject of the gospel preaching, and makes it a power of God unto salvation to every believer. Hence the apostolic office is called *ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης*. in opposition to the *διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως*, 2 Cor. iii. 9.—P. S.]

* [Seventh ed. by Lünemann, § 19, No. 26, p. 118. The article is often omitted before such substantives as are followed by a genitive of possession, *e. g.*, *εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ* Rom. i. 20; *ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν*, Matt. xvii. 6; *νοῦν κυρίου* 1 Cor. ii. 16, &c.—P. S.]

Notes on chaps. ii. 13, and iii. 21–31; *Doctrinal and Ethical* on iii. 21–31, No. 5; also the following works: Winzer, *Progr. de vocc. δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη et δικαιοῦν in P. ad Rom. Ep.*, Leipzig, 1831; Rauwenhoff, *Disquisitio de loco Paulino, qui est de δικαιώσει*, Lugd. Bat., 1852; Lipsius, *Die Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre, mit Vorwort von Liebner* (who differs from Lipsius), Leipzig, 1853 (220 pp.);* Schmid, *Biblische Theologie*, Stuttg., 1853, vol. ii. p. 331 ff.; Wieseler, Com. on Gal. ii. 16, Gött., 1859, p. 176 ff. (who very learnedly and ably defends the orthodox Protestant view); Hodge, on *Romans*, iii. 20 (new ed., Philad., 1866, p. 126 ff.); Forbes, on *Romans* (Edinb., 1868), pp. 102–144. The *doctrinal* treatises on justification by faith will be mentioned below, *ad* iii. 21–31, *Doctrinal and Ethical*, No. 5, pp. 138 f.—P. S.]

Is revealed [ἀποκαλύπτεται *is being revealed;* the present tense marks the continuous, progressive revelation of righteousness.—P. S.]. The ἀποκαλύπτειν is distinguished from the φανεροῦν by being God's revelation, which proceeds from God, and addresses itself to the inward spiritual world (Gal. i. 16); while the φανεροῦν denotes the same revelation as manifested in the outward life from the inward spiritual world (John ii. 11). The revelation of wrath is also an ἀποκάλυψις (ver. 18), although the wrath is revealed in external manifestation; for it is only by the conscience, that the facts connected therewith are first recognized as the phenomena of wrath, and it is only in the light of the New Testament truth that they are recognized completely. ἐν αὐτῷ. The gospel is the medium.

From faith to faith. [It is connected with the verb ἀποκαλύπτεται by De Wette, Meyer, Tholuck (ed. 5), Alford; with the noun δικαιοσύνη (sc. οὖσα or γινομένη) by Bengel, Philippi, Hodge, Forbes. The former agrees better with the position of the words, and with εἰς πίστιν, the latter with ἐκ πίστεως, comp. Rom. ix. 30; x. 6.—P. S.] The idea of faith appears here in accordance with the comprehensive idea of righteousness, and therefore as a hearty, trustful self-surrender (to rest and lean upon, הֶאֱמִין), which includes both knowledge and belief, assent and surrender, appropriation and application. [Faith is neither the efficient cause nor the objective ground of justification, but the instrumental cause and subjective condition; as eating is the condition of nourishment. As the nourishing power is in the food, which, however, must be received and digested before it can be of any use, so the saving power is in Christ's person and work, but becomes personally available, and is made our own, only by the appropriating organ of faith. This appropriation and assimilation must be continually renewed; hence ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν.—P. S.] The distinction between *from* faith and *to* faith is variously explained. Origen refers it to Old Testament and New Testament faith.† Œcumenius [Olshausen, De Wette, Alford, Philippi]: ἀπὸ πίστεως εἰς πιστεύοντα [*for the believer;* comp. iii. 22, where the δικ. θεοῦ is said to be εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας.—P. S.]. Theophylact and others: For the promotion of faith. Luther: From weak to strong faith.* Baumgarten-Crusius: From faith as conviction to faith as sentiment. De Wette: 1. Faith as conditional; 2. faith as receptive. For other meanings, see Tholuck (also the view of Zwingli, that the second πίστις means the faithfulness of God). [Meyer: The revelation of righteousness proceeds from faith and aims at faith, *ut fides habeatur* (similarly Fritzsche, Tholuck). Bengel and Hodge connect ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν with δικαιοσύνη, and take it as intensive, like the phrase, "death unto death," "life unto life," so as to mean *fidem meram*, entirely of faith, without any works. Ewald understands ἐκ πίστεως of *Divine* faith (?), εἰς πίστιν of *human* faith, which must meet the former.—P. S.] It may be asked, if the key to the passage may not be sought in chap. iii. 22, since the second half of that chapter is in general a commentary on this passage. Comp. Heb. xii. 2: "The author and finisher of our faith." At all events, the Apostle acknowledges, like the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the difference between degree of faith which receives the revelation prophetically and apostolically, in order to proclaim it, and a more general degree of faith, which, through the agency of preaching, extends into the world. Comp. Heb. xi. 1 ff.

As it is written. The same quotation from Hab. ii. 4 is found in Gal. iii. 11 and Heb. x. 38. The Apostle will here (as in ver. 2 and chaps. iv. and x.) prove the harmony of the gospel with the Old Testament. The passage in the Prophet Habakkuk declares: The just shall live by his confidence, his faith (Is. xxviii. 16). Therefore the most of the elder expositors, and some of the recent ones (Philippi, and others), thus explained the maxim of the Apostle: The just shall live by his faith. But according to Beza, Meyer [Hodge], and others, the Apostle's expression must be construed thus: The man who is justified by faith, shall live. Meyer properly says: Paul had a good reason to put this meaning into the prophetic expression: since the just man, if he would live by faith, must have been justified by faith. We read in Habakkuk two concrete definitions: "Behold, puffed up [הִנֵּה עֻפְּלָה], not upright is his soul [his life] within him [לֹא־יָשְׁרָה נַפְשׁוֹ בּוֹ]. But the just man, he shall live by his faith." That is, as the puffed-up soul is puffed up because it is not upright, and has no sound life, so is it the mark of the just man that he acquires his life by faith. The additional profundity which the New Testament gives to this Old Testament expression, does therefore not really change even the expression, much less the sense. [I prefer the connection of ἐκ πίστεως with ζήσεται, which is more agreeable to the Hebrew (although the other is favored by the Masoretic accentuation), and this is adopted also by Tholuck,

* [Lipsius says, p. 22, without proof: "The general Greek significance of the word δικαιόω remains *justum facere*, and must therefore have the preference before *justum habere*." To this Dr. Liebner, and Wieseler, on Gal. ii. 16, p. 179, justly object. Lipsius admits, however, that δικαιόω in Paul means *justum habere*, only not always, nor exclusively.—P. S.]

† [So also Chrysostom and Theodoret. A modification of this view is Tertullian's: *Ex fide legis in fidem evangelii.* —P. S.]

* [This is only a modification of the preceding explanation, and is substantially held also by Erasmus, Melanchthon, Calvin, Beza, Wordsworth, Forbes. The sense is: Beginning and ending with faith, from one degree of faith to another; faith is a vital principle and constant growth, receiving grace for grace, going from strength to strength, till it is transformed from glory to glory. Development is the law of spiritual as well as physical life; but in all the stages of growth of Christian life, the vital principle is the same; hence ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, *from* or *out of faith* as the root, *unto faith* as the blossom and fruit; faith, as Bengel says, the *prora et puppis*, the fore-deck and hind-deck of a ship—*i. e.*, all in all. Comp. ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, "from glory to glory," 2 Cor. iii. 18, and "from strength to strength," Ps. lxxxiv. 7.—P. S.]

De Wette, Philippi, Delitzsch (ad Hab. ii. 4), Ewald, Forbes. See Textual Note [8] above. The sense, however, is not essentially altered. The emphasis lies, at all events, on πίστις, which is, of course, *living* faith. ζήσεται is to be taken in the full sense of the ζωὴ αἰώνιος, as revealed in Christ. The Apostle, as Delitzsch remarks, puts no forced meaning into the words of the prophet, but simply places them into the light of the New Testament. Habakkuk ends where Paul begins.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The fundamental theme.* The joyfulness of the Apostle in anticipation of preaching the gospel without shame even in Rome, the central seat of the conceit of human wisdom. The source of this cheerfulness: The gospel is the power of God, &c. The heroic spirit of faith, philanthropy, and hope, elevates him above all hesitation. But how far is the gospel a power of God? See ver. 17, and the *Exeg. Notes* thereon. Especially on the righteousness of God, and the two fundamental forms of faith (the faith which has established preaching, and the faith which is established by preaching).

[2. St. Bernard: *Justus ex fide sua vivet, utique si vivat et ipsa: aliter quomodo vitam dabit, si ipsa sit mortua* (The just man shall live by his faith, if his faith itself live; otherwise how shall that which is itself death, give life?).—P. S.]

[3. "If the subject of the Epistle is to be stated in few words, these should be chosen: τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, δύναμις Θεοῦ εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. This expresses it better than merely '*justification by faith*,' which is, in fact, only a subordinate part of the great theme—only the *condition necessitated by man's sinfulness for his entering the state of salvation:* whereas the argument extends *beyond this*, to the *death unto sin* and *life unto God* and *carrying forward of the sanctifying work of the Spirit*, from its first fruits even to its completion;" Alford. Forbes (*Anal. Com.*, p. vii.) likewise denies that justification by faith, especially if presented in a bare, forensic form, is the leading doctrine of the Epistle. "The grand truth here enunciated is the warm, living reality of a personal UNION with CHRIST (contrasted with the previous union with Adam), by which, in place of the SIN unto DEATH communicated by the first head of humanity, Christ's RIGHTEOUSNESS and LIFE are communicated to the believer, and become the inward quickening mover of every thought, feeling, and action. Thus is the distinction preserved, yet the indissoluble connection clearly evinced, between *justification* and *sanctification*, as being but two aspects of one and the same UNION of the believer with CHRIST—just as the dying branch ingrafted into the living vine is then only *reckoned*, and may justly be declared to be, a sound, living branch, when the union has taken place—because the assurance is then given of its being *made* so finally and fully, the vital juices of the vine having already begun to circulate within it."—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Whence is it that many are ashamed of the gospel of Christ? Either, 1. They do not know it fully; or, 2. if they know it, they have not the courage to confess it.—Why do we not need to be ashamed of the gospel of Christ? Because, 1. It is of Divine origin; 2. of Divine import; 3. of Divine operation.—He who is ashamed of the gospel, is also ashamed of the Lord. True shame comes from God, false shame from the devil. Shame and shame.—Christianity the universal religion.—The shades of the law vanish; the stars of Greece grow pale at the rising sun of the gospel.—The righteousness which God approves is the chief import of the gospel.—The fundamental thought of the Epistle to the Romans is also the fundamental thought of the Reformation.

LUTHER: The power of God is such a force as to elevate man from sin to righteousness, from death to life, from hell to heaven, from the kingdom of the devil to the kingdom of God; and gives him eternal salvation.

STARKE: As the gospel is a power of God, he denies it who constantly appeals to his weakness, and presents it in opposition to the gospel.—Though the gospel is the power of God, no one will be compelled to be saved, but every one possesses his own freedom to resist, and is therefore responsible.—HEDINGER: Who would be ashamed of medicine when he is sick? or of light when he is blind, and would like to see? Wo to those who are ashamed of the words and office of Christ!

LANGE: Many a person is not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; but yet, if he is ashamed to follow Christ, he is in reality ashamed of the gospel itself in its true application and appropriation.—Faith is like a bucket, by which we draw grace for grace from that fulness of Jesus which contains the gospel.

SPENER: Faith in Christ, confidence in the grace of God in Christ, is the beginning of our salvation, and will remain its instrument to the end. Therefore, faith must always endure and increase, and will thus grow from faith to faith—from one degree of light and power to another.

BENGEL: No one need be ashamed of what is mighty and Divine (ver. 16).

GERLACH: There is something in the gospel of which the natural man is ashamed; therefore the Apostle confesses that this shame is conquered in his own case.—The effective power of God is not merely *in* the gospel, but it *is* the gospel itself. It is not merely a strength, from God, but it is His own strength. He works in and through the gospel.

LISCO: The gospel is a *power of God;* that is, a power in which He operates Himself. Therefore it is a holy, mighty, creative force, capable of saving all who believe it. On our part, *faith* is the condition that we must fulfil, the way to which we must conform, in order to obtain real salvation and deliverance from temporal and eternal destruction by the gospel.

HEUBNER: The danger of being ashamed of the gospel is easily incurred. Yet it is a shame which is very reprehensible; for, 1. It is a miserable weakness and want of principle to be ashamed of what is best; 2. It is the grossest contempt of God to place the world higher and fear it more than Him; and, 3. it is the meanest ingratitude toward God.

FR. A. WOLFF: The more the world boasts of its unbelief, the less should true Christians be ashamed of their faith. This is required: 1. For the honor of the truth; 2. the conversion of unbelievers; 3. the salvation of our own souls.

J. P. LANGE: How sad the contrast between the

false shame of Christians and the boldness and shamelessness of the world.—Who should be ashamed of the gospel? *i. e.*, 1. Of God's power and honor; 2. of the deliverance of men for their final salvation; 3. of the grand task of uniting Jews and Greeks (the law and culture) into a higher life.—The twofold confirmatory power of the gospel: 1. The first *for:* its Divine operation (ver. 16); 2. the second *for:* its Divine import (ver. 17).—The threefold *for* vers. 16, 17), or the *three* grounds of joyous, evangelizing activity.—The righteousness of faith: 1. Very old (Habakkuk); 2. eternally new (Paul, Luther); 3. always confirmed by true life.

[Burkitt: The power of the gospel is not from the preachers of the gospel; therefore do not idolize them. But they are God's instruments, and their words are the organ of the Spirit's power; therefore do not think meanly of them —A justified man lives a more holy, useful, and excellent life than all others; but the life that a justified man lives is always one of faith.—Henry (condensed): The reason why the Apostle made such a bold profession was, that sinners might be saved and believers edified.—Macknight: The Apostle insinuates with great propriety that the gospel is not an institution like the heathen mysteries, which were concealed from all but the initiated. The precepts of the gospel, being honorable in themselves and beneficial to society, cannot be too openly published.—Hodge: The salvation of men, including the pardon of their sins and the moral renovation of their hearts, can be effected by the gospel alone.—The power of the gospel does not lie in its pure theism, or perfect moral code, but in the cross—in the doctrine of justification by faith in a crucified Redeemer.—Whether we be wise or unwise, orthodox or heterodox, unless we are believers, and receive "the righteousness which is of God" as the ground of acceptance, we have no share in the salvation of the gospel.—Sermons on ver. 16, by B. Whichcote, John Owen, Bishop Ward, G. Esty, J. Erskine, Bishop Gilbert, Isaac Watts, Bishop Stillingfleet, Zollikofer, E Brackenbury, Geo. Burder, W E. Channing, R. McCheyne, and Thomas Arnold.—J. F. H.]

PART FIRST.

The Doctrine of Justification by Faith as the Restoration of the true Glorification of God.

CHAPTERS I.–XI.

FIRST DIVISION.

SIN AND GRACE IN THEIR FIRST ANTITHESIS, THE REALLY RELIGIOUS AND MORAL LIFE. THE ACTUAL ENTRANCE OF CORRUPTION AND SALVATION. GOD'S WRATH AT ALL HUMAN UNRIGHTEOUSNESS; THAT IS, THE WORLD'S REAL CORRUPTION MATURING FOR DEATH, AND HASTENED BY THE JUDGMENT OF GOD; AND THE OPPOSING JUSTIFICATION OF SINNERS THROUGH THE MERCY-SEAT, OR PARDON IN CHRIST IN RESPONSE TO FAITH. THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF FAITH.

Chapters I. 18–V. 11.

First Section.—*The beginning of all the real corruption of the world, and of the Gentiles in particular together with the judgment pronounced on it. The neglect of the general revelation of God in creation by the neglect of the real worship of God in thanksgiving and praise* (chap. i. 18–21).

Second Section.—*The development of Gentile corruption under God's judicial abandonment (the departure of His Spirit, and the decree of ripeness for judgment). From arbitrary symbolism to the worship of images and beasts; from theoretical to practical corruption; from natural to unnatural and abominable sins, to the completion of all kinds of crimes and iniquities, and to the demoniacal lust of evil, and even of evil maxims* (chap. i. 22–32).

18 For the wrath of God [God's wrath] is revealed [in opposition to that revelation of God's righteousness, ver. 17] from heaven against all ungodliness [godlessness] and unrighteousness [iniquity] of men, who hold [hold back][1] the truth in unrighteous-

19 ness; Because[2] that which may be known [which is known][3] of God is manifest
20 in them;[4] for God hath shewed [God manifested][5] *it* unto [to] them. For the
invisible things of him [his unseen attributes] from the creation of the world
are [are, since the creation of the world,][6] clearly seen,[7] being understood by
the things that are made [by means of *his* works], *even* his eternal power and
Godhead [Divinity,[8] θειότης, not θεότης]; so that[9] they are without excuse
21 [inexcusable, ἀναπολογήτους]. Because that, when they knew God [because,
knowing God, or, although they knew God, διότι γνόντες τὸν θεόν], they glorified
him not as God, neither were thankful [they did not glorify *him* as God, nor
give thanks *to him as God*]; but became vain in their imaginations [thoughts],
and their foolish heart was darkened.
22, 23 Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, And changed [ex
changed] the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man [for a likeness of an image of corruptible man], and to [of] birds,
and fourfooted beasts [quadrupeds], and creeping things [reptiles].
24 Wherefore God also[10] gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of
their own hearts [God delivered them over, in the lusts of their hearts, to
uncleanness], to dishonor their own bodies between themselves [so that their
25 bodies were dishonored among them].[11] Who changed [They who exchanged][12]
the truth of God into [for] a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more
26 [rather] than the Creator,[13] who is blessed forever. Amen. For this cause
God gave them up [delivered them over] unto [to] vile affections [shameful
passions]:[14] for even their women did change [exchanged] the natural use into
27 [for] that which is against nature: And likewise also the men, leaving the
natural use of the woman, burned in their lust [lustful excitement] one
toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly [working the
(well known) indecency, τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην], and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet [the due reward of their error].
28 And even as they did not like [And as they did not deem it worthy, or worth
while, οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν] to retain God in *their* knowledge, God gave them over to
a reprobate [worthless, ἀδόκιμον][15] mind, to do those things which are not con-
29 venient [becoming];[16] Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication,[17] wick-
edness [malice], covetousness, maliciousness [badness]; full of envy, murder,
30 debate [strife, ἔριδος], deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters [slanderers],
haters of God,[18] despiteful [insolent], proud, boasters, inventors of evil things
31 [villanies], disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenant-breakers
32 [truce-breakers], without natural affection, implacable,[19] unmerciful: Who, know-
ing [although they well know] the judgment [just decree] of God, that they
which [who] commit [practice, πράσσοντες] such things are worthy of death, not
only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them [approve of those
who practise *them*, συνευδοκοῦσιν τοῖς πράσσουσιν].

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 18.—[Or *hinder*. So Lange and Meyer: *aufhalten*. This is the meaning of κατέχειν here, as in 2 Thess. ii. 6, 7; Luke iv. 42. Comp. the *Exeg. Notes*, as also the note of Alford *in loc.*—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 19.—[διότι, contracted from δι' ὅ, τι, means (like διό) originally, *propter quod, quam ob rem, qua re, on account of which, wherefore*, and draws an inference from the preceding sentence; but in the N. T. it is always, and in the classics occasionally, used in the sense of διὰ τοῦτο ὅτι, *propterea quod, quia, because that, because*, and assigns a reason for a preceding assertion, like γάρ, *for*. It may here give the reason why the wrath of God is revealed (Meyer), or it may explain the words τῶν τὴν ἀλ. . . . κατεχόντων (De Wette, Tholuck, Alford). See *Exeg. Notes*. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford separate διότι from ver. 18 simply by a comma; Tholuck, Fritzsche, Theile, Philippi, by a period.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 19.—[τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, *quod notum est Dei* (Vulg.). This is the sense of γνωστός in the N. T., the Sept., and the Apocrypha (Luke ii. 44; John xviii. 15, 16; Acts i. 19; ii. 14; iv. 16, &c.), as ἄγνωστος means *unknown* (Acts xvii. 23); while, in the classics, γνωστός usually signifies *knowable, erkennbar*, as distinct from γνωτός, *known* (which word does not occur in the Greek Testament). The authorized version, therefore, is inconsistent with the biblical (though not with the classical) usage of the term, and conveys a false idea; for the heathen did not know all that may be known of God, but, as clearly appears from what follows, they knew only that which may be learned from the general revelation in the book of nature and reason, as distinct from the special revelation in the Bible and in the person of Christ. To retain the E. V., and to supply (with Robinson, *sub* γνωστός), *without revelation*, is arbitrary. Lange translates *Kenntniss, knowledge*; but γνωστόν is objective, γνῶσις is subjective, and does not suit φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς. There is no warrant in the *usus loquendi* for identifying the two, unless it be Gen. ii. 9, LXX.: γνωστὸν καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ. The Apostle purposely avoided the term γνῶσις or ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ θεοῦ, which is used in the N. T. of the true knowledge of God in Christ (comp. John xvii. 3), and chose the more general and objective term γνωστόν, that which is patent to all men in the works of creation.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 19.—[φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς, *in illis* (Vulg.), *i. e.*, ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, *in their hearts*; comp. ii.

15; Gal. i. 16. It refers to the inborn consciousness of God which is inseparable from our reason, and it contains the germ of the ontological argument of Anselm. Dr. Lange, however, renders, with Erasmus and others: *unter ihnen, among them*. See *Exeg. Notes*. Luther's version (*ihnen*) ignores the preposition ἐν.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 19.—[ἐφανέρωσεν, the historic aorist, referring to the original creation.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 20.—[τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασιν νοούμενα καθορᾶται. κτίσις here means the *act* of creation, ποιήμασι (*dativus instrumenti*), the *things* created, or creatures, and hence ἀπό is here not = ἐκ, which would be tautological, but, like the Hebrew מִן, *from the time of*, or *since*, *a condito mundo*.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 20.—[Alford objects to the E. V. and translates *are perceived*; but this destroys the striking oxymoron, ἀόρατα καθορᾶται, *invisibilia videntur, das Unschaubare wird erschaut, the invisible becomes visible*, or *the unseen is seen*, viz., by the mind's eye (νοούμενα). The compound καθορᾶν (ἅπαξ λεγόμενον in the N. T.) means to look down from a higher place, to take a survey, and hence often intensifies the simple verb = ἀκριβῶς ὁρᾶν, *pervidere, perspicere, to see clearly*.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 20.—[θειότης, *Göttlichkeit*, from θεῖος, *divinus*, refers to the Divine attributes, such as majesty, power, wisdom, goodness, which are manifest in creation; while θεότης, *deitas, Deity, Godhead, Gottheit*, from θεός, refers to the Divine Being itself, who created the world and dwelt in Christ.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 20.—[εἰς τό with the infinitive (used by Paul seventeen times in the Romans alone), like the Latin *ad* with the *gerund.*, indicates properly the *intention, in hoc ut, in order that* (comp. Rom. i. 11; iii. 26; iv. 11, 16, 18, &c.); but here it must indicate the (intended) *result*, = ὥστε, *ita ut, so that* (vi. 12; vii. 4, 5; 2 Cor. i. 4; comp. the *Exeg. Notes*, and Buttmann, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 227).—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 24.—Καί is retained by Meyer on account of its adaptation. [It indicates the correspondence between men's guilt and God's judgment; but the external authorities, ℵ. A. B. C., Vulgate, Orig., &c., are against it.—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 24. [τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς. The reading ἐν αὐτοῖς is sustained by ℵ. A. B. C. D*., against the *text. rec.*, ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, *among themselves, reciprocally*. Meyer defends the latter reading (referring it to the persons, αὐτῶν), in view of the frequent neglect of the reflex pronoun by the transcribers; *e. g.*, ver. 27.—ἀτιμάζεσθαι is passive (Beza, De Wette, Meyer, Lange, Alford), and not middle (Erasmus, Luther, E. V.); and hence αὐτῶν is preferable to αὑτῶν, and ἐν αὐτοῖς to ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, which may have arisen from imagining that "they," instead of τὰ σώματα, was the subject to ἀτιμάζ.—The genitive, τοῦ ἀτιμάζ, may be taken simply as *gen. appositionis*, explaining ἀκαθαρσία, which consisted in their bodies being dishonored; or as implying the purpose of God: *in order that* (= εἰς τό); or as denoting the consequence: *so that*. I prefer the last.—P. S.]

[12] Ver. 25.—[οἵτινες is used αἰτιολογικῶς, *quippe qui, seeing that they, such as*, indicating the class to which one belongs, and implying the reason of the preceding statement. μετήλλαξαν, *umtauschten*; the compound is stronger than ἤλλαξαν, *tauschten*; ver. 22.—P. S.]

[13] Ver. 25.—[παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, *beyond, rather than*, so as eventually to exclude the Creator altogether; comp. παρ' ἐκεῖνον, Luke xviii. 14, and παρὰ φύσιν, ver. 26. The nature of the case here decides for the exclusive rather than the comparative sense of παρά, since idolatry is incompatible with the worship of the true God, who shares His honor with no creature. See the *Exeg. Notes*.—P. S.]

[14] Ver. 26.—[Or shameful lusts, lusts of dishonor, πάθη ἀτιμίας, "stronger than ἄτιμα πάθη, as setting forth the *status*, ἀτιμία, to which the πάθη belonged" (Alford). Luther: *schändliche Lüste*. Lange: *Leidenschaften der Schande*. Meyer: *schandbare Leidenschaften*.—P. S.]

[15] Ver. 28.—[The paronomasia between δοκιμάζω and ἀδόκιμος, which strikingly brings out the adjustment of the punishment to the sin, is lost in the E. V. The Vulg. renders it imperfectly: *Non probaverunt—reprobrum sensum*. Lange: *Nicht würdig hielten—unwürdige* (*nichtsnutzige*) *Sinnesart*. Conybeare and Howson: "As they thought fit *to cast out* the acknowledgment of God, God gave them over to an *outcast* mind." Alford: "Because they *reprobated* the knowledge of God, God gave them over to a *reprobate* mind." But both Conybeare and Alford omit the ἔχειν.—P. S.]

[16] Ver. 28.—[τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα, *not becoming*, or *unbecoming, indecent, immoral*. The E. V. follows the Vulg.: *ea quæ non conveniunt*. But *convenient* is one of those words in the E. V. which have changed or modified their meaning, like *prevent, let*, &c., and are apt to bewilder the reader, and to mislead him by a false light. Comp. τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα, Eph. v. 4; and on the difference between μή and οὐκ, Winer, § 55, 5, p. 449 (7th ed.).—P. S.]

[17] Ver. 29.—As πορνεία has already been mentioned, it is here probably inserted for completeness' sake by Cod. L. and others, or substituted for πονηρία. See Tischendorf. [It is omitted by ℵ. A. B. C. K., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Meyer, Lange. It may have arisen from πονηρία, but may as easily have been overlooked on account of the similarity. Where the unnatural πορνεία, which was mentioned before, prevails, the ordinary πορνεία abounds also. Upon the whole, I would retain it.—P. S.]

[18] Ver. 30.—[θεοστυγεῖς always used in the passive sense: θεομίσητοι, *hated by God* (meaning the highest degree of reckless wickedness), and so taken here by Fritzsche, De Wette, Philippi, Meyer, Alford; while the majority of commentators (Theodoret. Œcumenius, Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Tholuck, Ewald, Wordsworth, Hodge) and versions (Syriac, Luth., E. V.) incline to the active sense: μισόθεοι, *Dei osores, enemies of God, Gottesfeinde*. So Suidas: θεοστυγεῖς θεομίσητοι, οἱ ἀπὸ θεοῦ μισούμενοι καὶ οἱ θεὸν μισοῦντες· παρὰ δὲ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ θεοστυγεῖς οὐχὶ οἱ ὑπὸ θεοῦ μισούμενοι, ἀλλ' οἱ μισοῦντες τὸν θεόν. The advocates of the active sense refer to θεομισής and βροτοστυγής as analogies: but Meyer insists that these, too, have the passive meaning, especially θεομισής = θεοστυγής, the opposite of θεοφιλής. Usage is undoubtedly in favor of the passive; but the connection, and the Scripture idea of God, are in favor of the active sense. The Apostle here describes the *sins* of the heathen, and not their *punishment*; and God hates *sin*, but loves the *sinner*. See the *Exeg. Notes*.—P. S.]

[19] Ver. 31.—ἀσπόνδους [in the *text. rec.* after ἀστόργους] is not sufficiently sustained by Codd. C. D., *al.* and sounds rather weak between these strong terms. [Omitted by ℵ. A. B. D*. G., and cancelled by Mill, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer. Alford regards it as a gloss in margin to explain ἀσυνθέτους; Meyer as an insertion from the similar catalogue, 2 Tim. iii. 3.—P. S.]

General Remarks.—The whole section, in its progress to the end of the chapter, relates more particularly to the heathen world (Tholuck, Meyer). Yet it describes the corruption in its original form as a general corruption of humanity. The antithesis: Heathendom and Judaism was a subsequent development. Ver. 24, with its causality in vers. 22 and 23, constitutes the more definite beginning of heathenism. Tholuck recommends the treatise of Adam, *Exercitationes Exegeticæ*, 1712, pp. 501–738, on the section vers. 18–32. Tholuck remarks: "What the Apostle says of the relations of the Gentile world, and afterwards of the Jews, to God, naturally applies to their universality, but to individuals only in a greater or less degree." We add: So that a relative opposition is embraced within the general judgment (see chap. ii. 6 ff.).

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

First Section, vers. 18–21.

Ver. 18. **For God's wrath is revealed.** The ἀποκάλυψις of the ὀργὴ θεοῦ, as the revelation which was historically earlier, is contrasted with the revelation of the righteousness of God from faith. It is therewith intimated that that righteousness denotes grace, or justifying righteousness; but that the ὀργὴ θεοῦ is an exercise of penal righteousness which precedes it.* The *wrath of God*, as an emotion of God,

* [The *wrath* of God is an anthropopathic but most truthful expression of the punitive justice and holiness of God over-against sin, and perfectly harmonizes with His love, which is holy, and repels the evil with the same en-

is His personal displeasure at sin as ἀσέβεια, as conscious transgression, as apostasy, as unbelief, and therefore as the limitation of His personal revelation in the world. It is a displeasure which is revealed by such decrees of penal justice as death and the terrors of death, especially in retribution for obstructions placed in the way of the divine life (Exod. iv. 14, 24; Ps. xc. 7, 8), by a decree of blindness in retribution for the hinderances to His truth (the present passages; Is. vi. 10; Rom. ix.; 2 Cor. iii. 14; Matt. xiii. 14; John xii. 40; Acts xxviii. 26), by the abandonment to the lusts of the flesh in retribution for the general resistance to His Spirit (Eph. ii. 3), and finally, by a decree of reprobation and condemnation in retribution for the hinderances to salvation by apostasy and unbelief (Matt. iii. 7; xxii. 13; John iii. 36; Rom. v. 9). Comp. my article, *Zorn Gottes*, in Herzog's *Realencyklopædie*. This ὀργὴ θεοῦ has its ἀποκάλυψις immediately, so far as it is declared to the conscience of man as God's decree from heaven; but it becomes especially an ἀποκάλυψις by the witness of the law, and is perfected in the light of the gospel. It is revealed in a real manner **from heaven**, as a message from the height of the holy, supernatural world, and from the throne of Divine government. And it is revealed in an ideal way by the light of righteousness, which, like a flame of wrath from the kingdom of the Spirit, shines down into the realm of consciously guilty human life, and explains its dark fate. The older writers understood by ὀργή, punishment alone, taking metonymically the operation for the cause [*metonymia causæ pro effectu* = κόλασις, τιμωρία]. But we must unite both. The opposite of ὀργή is not merely ἀγάπη (Tholuck), but ἔλεος (see my *Positive Dogmatik*, p. 109). According to De Wette [and Alford], *wrath* is only an anthropopathic conception of the righteousness of God in punishment; but by this interpretation its procession ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ is obliterated. The internal ἀποκάλυψις of wrath involves its external φανέρωσις, but it is one-sided to confine it to the punishment which God has determined for the heathen world (De Wette), or the wretched condition of the world at that time (Köllner), or to the manifestation of the punishment in the conscience (Tholuck), or in the gospel (Grotius). From the beginning, the deeds of wrath have ever succeeded the ἀσέβεια in its opposition to God's government and revelation. But the complete ἀποκάλυψις thereof does not appear before the New Testament ἀποκάλυψις of grace. The reason of this is, that the world's guilt reaches its climax in the crucifixion and death of Christ. The ἀσέβεια—the rebellion of unbelief to the revelation of the divine light and life (chap. ii. 4, 5; viii. 6, 7)—sums up the whole idea of sin which incurs the guilt of God's wrath. The idea of the ὀργή itself is God's abandonment of man to the judgment of death. And the idea of the ἀποκάλυψις of this ὀργή is the entire revelation of the judgment of God in the corruption of the world amid the light of the gospel, for the conscience of humanity, especially the body of believers. The idea of the οὐρανός is the heavenly world in its ideal laws, which lie also at the foundation of the earthly world, and react against all abnormal conduct with punishment and death. The present, ἀποκαλύπτεται, must be emphasized; it is neither merely a historical reference to the misery of the old world (Köllner, and others), nor (with Chrysostom, and others) a reference to the future day of wrath. It means, rather, a progressive revelation of the judgment in opposition to which the progressive revelation of the righteousness of salvation in the gospel acquires its perfect significance and clearness. The ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ certainly refers chiefly to ἀποκαλύπτεται, but it is indirectly declared thereby that the ὀργὴ θεοῦ is from heaven, although, as a judgment immanent in life itself, it breaks forth from its internal state, or is caused by it. Special interpretations of the ὀργή: The religion of the Old Testament (Bengel); storms and natural disasters (Pelagius); external and internal necessities of the times (Baumgarten-Crusius).

Against all ungodliness and unrighteousness. The ἀσέβεια [godlessness, impiety] is the fundamental form of personal misconduct toward God; but the word is more especially significant in that it describes ungodliness as *the absence of reverence for God.* See ver. 21. The ἀδικία [unrighteousness, iniquity] is the correspondent fundamental form of misconduct toward God's law in life, and therefore not toward our neighbor alone. Theophylact, Tholuck, and many others: *Profanitas in Deum, injuria in proximum.* [So Hodge: ἀσέβεια, impiety toward God; ἀδικία, injustice toward men.—P. S.] Meyer, on the contrary: Irreligiousness and immorality, which is supported by the following description. ['Ασέβεια is the fountain of ἀδικία, but both act and react upon each other.—P. S.]—**Of men.** Antithesis of ὀργὴ θεοῦ. The word signifies, first, the universality of guilt; second, the weakness of man's enmity against Almighty God.

Who hold back the truth. Description of the obstructions which, as the wicked reaction against the revelation of God, cause the reaction of Divine displeasure in the form of the ὀργή. The *truth* is the revelation of God in its most general sense, as the *unity and harmony* of all the single Divine acts of revelation, with a special reference here to the natural revelation of God (vers. 19, 20); although the doctrines of the gospel (of which Ammon explains ἀλήθεια) must not be excluded from the general idea, nor must the natural knowledge of God be substituted for the revelation of God. The κατέχειν (to grasp, to hold, here with the accessory idea of holding back) strikingly denotes hinderance, *keeping back* (Meyer, improperly, *keeping down*); as is the case with καταλαμβάνειν in John i. 5.* An odd explanation is this: "Who possess the truth with unrighteousness; that is, sin against better knowledge" (Michaelis, Koppe, Baur).—In

gy with which it attracts the good. No man can love, who cannot hate. Wrath, or hatred, is inverted love. But while the wrath of man is a passion, and destroys the sinner, God's wrath is a calm and holy energy, and restores the sinner by destroying sin. Meyer *in loc.*: "*Der Zorn Gottes ist die Liebe des heiligen Gottes zu allem Guten in ihrer entgegengesetzten Energie gegen alles Böse.*" He quotes Lactantius, *De ira Dei*, v. 9: "*Si Deus non irascitur impiis et injustis, nec pios justosque diligit; in rebus enim diversis aut in utramque partem moveri necesse est, aut in neutram.*" Comp. also Tholuck on Matt. v. 22, and Harless on Eph. iii. 3.—P. S.]

* [Wordsworth *in loc.*: "*Holding, keeping down, the truth in ungodliness*, as in a prison-house. Men have incarcerated the truth, and hold her a captive under restraint and durance, with the bars and bolts of a depraved will and vicious habits, so that she cannot go forth and breathe the air and see the light, and do works suitable to her own nature." The passage implies, however, that man has the remnants of the Divine image in him, and that, though fallen in Adam, he may fall still deeper by obscuring and suppressing the elements of truth in his reason and conscience. The reference to καταλαμβάνειν, John i. 5, is questionable. But see Lange *in loc.*—P. S.]

unrighteousness. Not adverbial (Reiche, *et al.*), but instrumental (Meyer).* The word must be understood here in the wide sense, according to which all sin is ἀδικία. See 1 John iii. 4. The sentence must be understood, however, in its general force, though with special reference already to the Gentiles. The history of this κατέχειν is the history of the kingdom of darkness in humanity, which is consummated in the ἀντικείμενος, 2 Thess. ii. 8; comp. especially also 2 Thess. i. 8. According to De Wette, the κατέχειν operates so as not to let the truth come to appearance and development. But it also so operates as to pervert the individual elements of the truth into distortions, errors, and strong delusions, and thereby calls down the wrath of God. We must observe how decidedly the Apostle here views the ἀπιστία ethically as ἀπείθεια; and how he derives the errors of unbelief from unrighteousness, and from misconduct toward the ethical laws of the inner life.

Ver. 19. **Because that which is known of God.**† The διότι in ver. 19 may be regarded as an explanation of the statement in ver. 18, with special reference to the holding back of the truth of God; the διότι in ver. 21 as the explanation of the preceding ἀναπολογήτους εἶναι; and the διὸ in ver. 24, as well as the διὰ τοῦτο in ver. 26, as the explanation of the revelation of God's wrath. Though the διότι of ver. 19 is not to be regarded exactly the same as γάρ, it does not serve specially as a proof of the motive for Divine wrath. For more particular information, see Tholuck and Meyer.‡

The knowledge of God.§ Tholuck distinguishes three meanings of γνωστόν: 1. That which *is known* of God (Itala, Vulg., De Wette [Meyer, Philippi, Alford, Wordsworth.—P. S.]); 2. what *may be known* (Photius, and many others; Rückert); 3. *knowledge* [= γνῶσις. Fritzsche, Tholuck, Hodge.—P. S.]. He shows that γνωστός, according to the classical use of the language, means, *what may be known;* while γνωτός means, *what is known.* But in the Septuagint and New Testament the signification, *known*, is undoubted. Nevertheless, many expositors, from the time of Origen down to the present [Theophylact, Œcumenius, Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Ewald], have pronounced in favor of the translation, *what may be known.* But this signification does not make good sense, since it is difficult to distinguish between what may, and what may not be known of God, and since every thing that may be known of God was by no means revealed at the beginning to the nations (see Meyer). We understand what is known of God concretely as *knowledge* [*Kenntniss*, γνῶσις], *notitia dei*—which should become true knowledge [*Erkenntniss*, ἐπίγνωσις] by living appropriation. Luther has made the untenable distinction, that the reason of man can know that God is, but cannot know who or what He is. Tholuck justly remarks that the Apostle immediately afterward speaks of a certain knowledge of the nature of God. [The book of nature is a παιδευτήριον θεογνωσίας, as Basil (*Hexaëmeron*, i.) calls it, a school of the general knowledge of God, and there is no nation on earth which is entirely destitute of this knowledge.—P. S.]

Is manifest among them.* Erasmus, Grotius, Köllner, and Baumgarten-Crusius, adopt this explanation.† On the contrary, Tholuck, Meyer, and De Wette—with reference to chap. ii. 15; Gal. i. 16—strongly advocate Calvin's interpretation, *cordibus insculptum.* [So also Beza: "*In ipsorum animis, quia hæc Dei notitia recondita est in intimis mentis penetralibus;*" and Hodge: "It is not of a mere external revelation of which the Apostle is speaking, but of that evidence of the being and perfection of God which every man has in the constitution of his own nature, and in virtue of which he is competent to apprehend the manifestations of God in His works."—P. S.] But ἀποκαλύψαι stands in Gal. i. 16; and in Rom. ii. 15, the question is God's manifestation by conscience, and not by creation. De Wette says: If the knowledge of God had been something common among them, it would not have been suppressed (κατεχόμενον).‡ But this is not conclusive. We could say with more propriety: If there had been no general knowledge of God among them, there would have been no common guilt. We must admit, however, that *among them* presupposes *in them*, or the existence of a knowledge of God in their hearts.—**God manifested it to them.** This was not first of all ἀποκάλυψις, but φανέρωσις—manifestation through creation. And thus there arose from individuals a manifest knowledge of God—a φανερόν. The reference of this φανερόν to the gnosis of the philosophers (Erasmus, Grotius) is too contracted. But there was a tradition of the knowledge of God among men which preceded the development of heathenism. (It is hardly worth while to mention the explanation of Luther, Koppe, Flatt, that ἐν αὐτοῖς is the mere dative.) [There is a threefold revelation of God: 1. An internal revelation to the reason and conscience of every man (comp. ii. 15; John i. 9); 2. an external revelation in the creation, which proclaims God's power, wisdom, and goodness (Rom. i. 20); 3. a special revelation, through the Holy Scriptures, and in the person and work of Christ, which confirms and completes the other revelations, and exhibits the justice, holiness, and love of God. The first two are here intended.—P. S.]

Ver. 20. **For his invisible attributes** [τὰ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ]. Explanation of the declaration: "God manifested it to them." Meyer: "*That may not be seen of Him* (*sein Unschaubares*), the invisible attributes which constitute His essence, not *actiones Dei invisibiles.*" (Theodoret and Fritzsche: In relation to both creation and providence.) The pictures of creation, however, are also permanent

* [Also Alford, who justly remarks that the pregnant ἐν, "*in and by*," implies that their ἀδικία is the status wherein, and the instrument whereby, they hold back the truth lit up in their consciences.—P. S.]

† [Vers. 19, 20, as also vers. 20–26, and ver. 27 of this chapter, are quoted by Hippolytus, in his recently discovered *Philosophumena*, or *Refut. omnium hæres.*, lib. ix. c. 9, p. 444, and v. 7, p. 140, ed. Duncker and Schneidewin.—P. S.]

‡ [These two commentators, however, differ in their exposition of διότι. See Textual Note [2]. The Apostle proves first that men *had* the ἀλήθεια (19, 20), and then that they *held it back*, and perverted it into a lie (21–23), and that therefore (διό) God's wrath came upon them (24 ff.).—P. S.]

§ [So Dr. Lange translates τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, but I cannot agree. See Textual Note [3].—P. S.]

* [So Dr. Lange translates ἐν αὐτοῖς, *unter ihnen, among them*, instead of *in them*. See Text. Note [4].—P. S.]

† [Erasmus and Grotius, with the restriction to the superior knowledge of heathen philosophers, as Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato; others in the sense that the knowledge of God was a common revelation, accessible to all. Dr. Lange takes the latter view, as appears from what follows.—P. S.]

‡ [Precisely the same remark is made by Alford, who often follows De Wette very closely.—P. S.]

actiones, and so far providence is at least indicated. [The ἀόρατα is subsequently explained by δύναμις and θειότης, and the τέ, followed by καί, as Tholuck remarks, does not annex a new idea (*and also*), but it partitions the ἀόρατα into the two ideas of δύναμις and θειότης. Paul has in view simply some of the Divine attributes, not the whole Divine being (which would rather require τὸ ἀόρατον); the pagan knowledge of God is only partial and fragmentary, though sufficient to leave those who possess it without excuse.—P. S.]

From the time of the creation of the world. Not *out of* the creation (Luther, and others). This idea is contained in τοῖς ποιήμ. (De Wette). κτίσις, moreover, is here equal to καταβολή (Fritzsche).—**Being understood by the things that are made.*** An oxymoron, Arist., *De mundo C.* [vi.]: [πάσῃ θνητῇ φύσει γενόμενος] ἀθεώρητος ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων θεωρεῖται ὁ θεός.† Meyer thus paraphrases the νοούμενα καθορᾶται: It is beheld by being perceived with the reason. We might ask: Should the sentence read, The invisible becomes visible by knowledge, as the means; or, it becomes visible as something known, perceptible to the reason? The latter thought is preferable here, since it is better adapted to the participle, and presupposes the import of the power, the thought-life of man. Philippi also limits himself to the middle form: "The invisible is seen; an oxymoron which is explained and qualified by the addition of νοούμενα. It is not seen by the bodily eye, but by the eye of the Spirit, the νοῦς, the reason." Our view is favored by the original sense of καθορᾶν, a conception which passes through *looking down* and *looking over* into *looking at*.—**By the things that are made** [by and in (*his*) **works**, τοῖς ποιήμασιν, instrumental dative.—P. S.]. These are therefore signs of the attributes of God. Schneckenburger (after Episcopius, and others) includes among them the government of God in history. But the conception of מַעֲשֶׂה, *creature*, is against this view. Baumgarten-Crusius, following the Syriac and other versions, takes ποιήμασι in an ablative sense—*by the creature*—which is quite untenable.—**His eternal power and divinity.** [ἀΐδιος, from ἀεί, ever-enduring, eternal, belongs to both nouns. Here is the germ of the physico-theological argument for the existence of God, as in ver. 19 the ontological argument is intimated.—P. S.] Here, as in the Creed [I believe in God the Father Almighty], omnipotence serves as the representative of the attributes of God. Tholuck: "In the contemplation of nature, the first thing which strikes man with overpowering weight is the impression of an infinite, supernatural omnipotence (Book of Wisdom xiii. 4). All religion has its root in the feeling of dependence on supernatural powers (?). To the patriarchs God first revealed Himself as שַׁדַּי, as the *Almighty*; Ex. vi. 3" (Gen. xvii. 1).‡

—**And his Divinity.** θειότης, from θεῖος, is the summary of the divinities, or divine excellencies, and must be distinguished from θεότης, the term which denotes the Divine Being itself. The omnipotence is completed by the remaining Divine attributes, through which it really becomes omnipotence in the full ethical as well as metaphysical sense. It is onesided if Schneckenburger refers it only to God's goodness. Reiche's thought is better, that wisdom and goodness are chiefly meant.

So that they are without excuse. Meyer does not regard the εἰς as expressing a consequence—as most commentators do [Vulg.: *Ita ut sint inexcusabiles;* Chrysostom, Luther, Reiche, De Wette, Fritzsche, Tholuck, Philippi, Ewald, Alford, Wordsworth, Hodge]—but a purpose (in harmony with Calvin, Beza, and others): *In order that they may be without excuse.* But this rendering leads to a monstrous view of the purpose of the creation of the world. It is too fatalistic even for the conception of predestination, which it was once designed to support. Meyer urges in its defence that εἰς, in the Epistle to the Romans, when used with τό and the infinitive, has always a teleological sense, against which [De Wette and] Tholuck (p. 67) protest. Then he insists that the results must also be determined beforehand. But this would be a kind of predestination which is self-contradictory: Predestinated—to have no excuse; that is, predestinated for guilt. The other explanation implies by no means a *sufficientia religionis naturalis ad salutem*, but it permits the possibility of another form of the course of development from Adam to Christ. [The object here is to show man's guilt, not God's sovereignty. Comp. on εἰς τό the Textual Note [8]. Hodge: "Paul does not here teach that it is the design of God, in revealing Himself to men, to render their opposition inexcusable, but rather, since this revelation has been made, they have in fact no apology for their ignorance and neglect of God. Though the revelation of God in His works is sufficient to render men inexcusable, it does not follow that it is sufficient to lead men, blinded by sin, to a saving knowledge of Himself." Wordsworth: "It can hardly be thought that the conviction, confusion, and condemnation of men was any part of the Divine *plan* in creation, although it followed as a *consequence* from it."—P. S.]

Ver. 21. **Because, although they knew God, &c.** The διότι explains first of all how far they are without excuse; then, indirectly, how their guilt of holding back the truth in unrighteousness commenced. Incorrect construction: *cum cognoscere potuissent* (Œcumenius, Flatt).* Meyer has no ground for opposing the solution of the participle γνόντες into the sentence: *although* they knew God (not, *perceived* Him). The contradiction between knowing God and the designated neglect of Him is obvious indeed; but herein precisely consists the inexcusableness. The ignorance (ἄγνοια) of the Gentile world, Eph. iv. 18, &c., is improperly regarded by Tholuck as an apparent contradiction, for the Gentile world was not such at the outset, and its ignorance is the result and punishment of its great sin of neglect. They lost even their imperfect knowledge (γνῶσις), because they did not raise it to

* [Lange: *Die Unschaubarkeiten werden als Erkanntes angeschaut.* Comp. Textual Note [7].—P. S.]

† [Similar passages are quoted from Cicero, *De Divin.*, ii. 72: "*Esse præstantem aliquam æternamque naturam . . . pulchritudo mundi ordoque rerum cœlestium cogit confiteri;*" and *Quæst. Tusc.*, i. 29: "*Deum non vides, tamen Deum agnoscis ex ejus operibus.*" Comp. also Bengel *in loc.*: "*Incomparabile oxymoron. Invisibilia Dei, si unquam, certe in creatione facta essent visibilia: sed tum quoque non nisi per intelligentiam videri cœperunt.*"—P. S.]

‡ [Alford: "Eternal, and Almighty, have always been recognised epithets of the Creator."—P. S.]

* [Alford: 'γνόντες, '*with the knowledge above stated.*' This participle testifies plainly that matter of *fact*, and not of *possibility*, has been the subject of the foregoing verses. From this point, we take up what they *might have done, but did not.*"—P. S.]

full knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις) through the labor of the heart. [τὸν θεόν, the one true God, in opposition to the false θεοί whom the heathen worshipped.—P. S.]

They glorified him not as God. According to His divinity (John iv. 24). They were not wanting in worship, but in worship suitable to God. Melanchthon refers δοξάζειν to theoretical, and εὐχαριστεῖν to practical conduct toward God (as recognition and reverence); but Tholuck very justly rejects such an interpretation, and regards δοξάζειν as the general term for worship, and εὐχ. as the special designation of that species in which the feeling of dependence exhibits itself in the most tender and truly human way. In our opinion, the former denotes rather all worship, so far as it should be preëminently the glorification of God; the latter denotes the same worship as the grateful recognition of the Divine government for human welfare.*

But became vain [ἐματαιώθησαν]. They became idle, foolish, in devising vanities (Is. xliv. 9), vain idols, μάταια (Acts xiv. 15). [ματαιότης, הֶבֶל, *vanitas*, is a characteristic term for idol-worship; Deut. xxxii. 21; 2 Kings xvii. 5; Jer. ii. 5; Acts xiv. 15.—P. S.] "As man, so his God." The axiom may also be reversed: As his God, so man himself (Ps. cxv. 8): *They that make them are like unto them.* The human mind is made dumb, wooden, and stone-like, by dumb, wooden, and stone idols (comp. Acts xvii. 29). But that vanity began in the inward life.—**In their imaginations [thoughts, reasonings, speculations,** διαλογισμοῖς]. Tholuck: "We can scarcely coincide with the Vulgate, Fritzsche, Meyer, and Philippi, in translating διαλογισμοί simply by *cogitata*. But since the word is used usually *malo sensu*, and the antithesis is more expressive, we may translate it, with Luther: 'In their imagining;' Beza: *rationibus suis*. We need not think exclusively of the reasonings and conclusions of the philosophers (Philippi)." Mythology was complete with its growth of ideals and images long before philosophy proper was conceived.

And their foolish heart was darkened. The supposition that "foolish" (ἀσύνετος) is used proleptically in the sense that their heart was darkened so as to lose its understanding (De Wette), is not only unnecessary (Tholuck), but altogether irrelevant (Meyer: "because it destroys the climax").† Positive darkness was the result of the negative neglect of the heart to regard the Divine tokens, and to weigh them understandingly. The καρδία, the centre of life, is first darkened; then the διάνοια, the developed thought-life (Eph. iv. 18). Tholuck: In this section the Apostle coincides so fully in word and thought with the Book of Wisdom, chaps. xiii.–xv., that Nitzsch regards it "almost impossible" to ascribe perfect originality to him. Yet he himself admits that the fundamental thought—the tracing of idolatry back to sin—was unknown to the Alexandrine author, &c. (comp. Nitzsch, *Deutsche Zeitschrift*, 1850, p. 387; Bleek, *Stud. und Kritiken*, 1853, p. 340).

SECOND SECTION, vers. 22–31.

Ver. 22. **Professing themselves** [i. e., *while* not *because*, they professed themselves, φάσκοντες, or pretended] **to be wise.** De Wette: "This is referred by many, and also by Tholuck, to the philosophers of ancient Greece and Rome. But these were above idolatry, and, besides, were later than the origin of idolatry," &c.* The latter remark requires special attention. The question here is concerning the very ancient origin of heathendom, as characterized by the far-fetched ingenuities of symbolical mythicism. Nor could Paul have had in thought merely the pride of Grecian wisdom But in contemplating it, he could also judge concerning the origin of heathenism. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 19–25; iii. 19. Calvin: "*Neque enim id proprie in philosophos competit, etc., sed æque commune est gentium ordinumque omnium. Nemo enim fuit, qui non voluerit Dei majestatem sub captum suum includere, ac talem Deum facere, qualem percipere posset suopte sensu.*"—**They became fools.** Not, they have by this means shown themselves to be fools (Köllner), which weakens the thought. [Their folly was in proportion to their boast of wisdom. There can be no greater folly than to worship a beast rather than God. Wordsworth *in loc.*: "Intelligence is no safeguard against superstition. Knowledge puffeth up (1 Cor. viii. 1). It often engenders pride, and pride is punished by God with spiritual blindness, which is the mother of idolatry."—P. S.]

Ver. 23. **And exchanged,** &c. They have abandoned the real δόξα [כְּבוֹד יְהוָֹה]—the contemplation of God's glory—which was communicated to them through the spiritual contemplation of the creation, which was manifested to the Israelites in the Shekinah in the exalted moments of vision, and which was finally communicated to Christians in the righteousness of Christ for faith. They exchanged this glory for their religious images—that is, for vanity, folly, and darkness. "The ἐν cannot be taken for εἰς (Reiche [E. V.]), but is instrumental" (Meyer). It denotes the external element of their exchange. [The verb ἀλλάσσειν, when it means *to exchange*, is usually construed with τί τινος or ἀντί τινος, *permutare rem per rem* or *re*, but in the LXX. with ἐν, after the Hebrew הֵמִיר בְּ, as in Ps. cvi. 20: ἠλλάξαντο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν ἐν ὁμοιώματι μόσχου, κ.τ.λ. Tholuck quotes also Sophocles, *Antig.*, ver. 936, for the same construction. The contrast of ἀφθάρτου and φθαρτοῦ sets forth the folly of such an exchange.—P.S.] Grotius: ὁμοίωμα εἰκόνος, *figura, quæ apparet in simulacro.* Meyer quotes Rev. ix. 7 in favor of this view. But the expression seems to indicate that the worship of images proceeded from an arbitrary, self-created symbolism. They believed that they wisely expressed and maintained the δόξα of God in the symbol or likeness of a human image. For this purpose they naturally made use of the image of the external and therefore perishable form of man. This was specially the case among the Greeks. There were also the Egyptian images of beasts: of birds

* [Bengel: "GRATIAS AGERE (εὐχαρ.) *debemus ob beneficia:* GLORIFICARE (δοξάζ.) *ob ipsas virtutes divinas.*"—P. S.]

† [Alford: "THEIR HEART (καρδία of the whole inner man, the seat of knowledge and feeling) BEING FOOLISH (unintelligent, not retaining God in its knowledge) BECAME DARK (lost the little light it had, and wandered blindly in the mases of folly)."—P. S.]

* [In like manner, Meyer and Alford refer the words not so much to the schools of philosophy, as to the assumption of wisdom by the Greeks in general (1 Cor. i. 21), which is always connected with an alienation from the truth of God. Tholuck, also, in his *fifth* edition, refers the passage expressly to the whole civilised heathen world which looked down upon the rest of mankind as outside barbarians (i. 14) —P. S.]

—the bird Ibis; of **four-footed beasts**—the Apis, the dog and the cat; and of **creeping things**—the crocodile and the serpent. Tholuck: The Egyptian worship was at that time domesticated at Rome;* and the expression of Paul relates as well to the adoration of the symbol, generally practised by the cultivated classes, as to the adoration of the image itself, as a real idol, which prevailed among the great masses (see Tholuck). [The common people saw in the idols the gods themselves, the cultivated heathen, symbolical representations, or, at best, only the organs through which the gods operated. A similar difference of a gross and a more refined superstition is found in the Roman Catholic Church with regard to the images of saints. The Scriptures make no account of this distinction, and denounce all image-worshippers as idolaters.—P. S.] The Apostle traces the downward tendency of heathendom, by passing, first, from the likeness to the image, and, second, from the image of man to the images of creeping animals. [Wordsworth: "καὶ—καὶ—καὶ—observe this repetition, marking successive stages of their moral and intellectual degradation: ending in the transmutation of the living God of heaven into the likeness of unclean reptiles crawling upon the earth!"—P. S.]

Ver. 24. **Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness.** The Apostle evidently distinguishes two degrees of this abandonment; ver. 24 and ver. 26. As the unnatural sins of lust are not mentioned before ver. 26, so may we understand ver. 24 as referring to the natural forms of sensuality. But lewdness is the sin common to both degrees of corruption. That the Apostle should regard sins of lust as the immediate result of religious apostasy, rests: 1. On the Hebrew idea of whoredom, according to which religious whoredom—that is, idolatry—leads to moral whoredom as its most immediate result (Num. xxv.; Ezek. xxiii.); just as, reversely, moral unchastity leads to religious lewdness (Solomon, Henry IV. [of France]). The heathen forms of worship are therefore connected in various ways with the practice of lust, or they are even the worship of lust. 2. On the ethical law, that moral principles stand in reciprocal connection with religious principles. The image of corruptible man is an image of the natural man, who, like Jupiter, indulges in love intrigues. The image of the bull likewise indicates the deification of the generative power of nature.

Wherefore God gave them up [παρέδωκεν, *delivered them over*]. The abandonment must not be regarded, with the Greek expositors [since Origen], as a mere permission† (συγχώρησις—see Chrysostom's remarks, quoted by Tholuck [who dissents from him]), nor, on the other hand, as referring to a Divine predestination of abandonment to the judgment of condemnation. (Tholuck, the editor of Calvin's Commentaries, calls this the Calvinistic view, according to which God is the effective author of sin;—but this he could certainly not prove from Calvin's exposition of the present passage. The abandonment is rather the first stage in the exercise of punitive authority (see my *Positive Dogmatics*, p. 468). God executed this punishment on a grand scale in the origin and growth of heathendom. He allowed the Gentiles to walk in their own ways (Acts xiv. 16; Ps. lxxxi. 13; cxlvii. 20). The *permittere* in this punishment becomes an *effective* operation by God's withdrawal of His Spirit; which measure His holiness requires.* Paul has already said that this withdrawal is retributive; but he now makes it especially prominent: **in the lusts of their hearts**, ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις, &c. The ἐν must not be understood as instrumental [*by* or *through*] (Erasmus [E. V.], and others), nor like εἰς (Piscat., Estius, and others) [but signifies the element or moral condition *in* which they were already when God, by a judicial act, delivered them over to a still worse condition.—P. S.]. The negative punitive judgment becomes positive in this, that they can no longer control the lusts of their heart after God's Spirit is withdrawn from them. It is in harmony with God's righteousness that sin should be punished by sin.—**To uncleanness.** The sins of thought and heart became sins of deed. The expression *filthiness* (*Unflätherei*, Meyer) seems too strong for the beginning of the development of uncleanness. In Gal. v. 19 (to which Meyer refers), the description passes from the grosser to the more subtle forms.

So that their bodies were dishonored. De Wette and Tholuck [Meyer, Alford, *al.*] maintain that ἀτιμάζεσθαι does not occur in the middle (Erasmus, Luther [E. V.]), but only in the passive voice. The bodies were already dishonored by natural lewdness, by which they lost their dignity as temples of God, and were degraded into instruments of sensual lust (and not merely "woman;" Tholuck). See 1 Cor. vi. 16.—**Between themselves.** Three explanations: 1. The ἐν is instrumental (Theophylact, Köllner). Then the moral subject is wanting. 2. The ἐν αὐτοῖς has a reciprocal signification equal to ἐν ἀλλήλοις, *reciprocally* (Erasmus, De Wette, Tholuck, and others). Meyer: One dishonors the other. This construction is favored by the reciprocal sexual intercourse which disappears in the unnatural lewdness described in ver. 26. 3. Reflexive (Vulgate, Luther, Calvin, and others). Tholuck remarks on this, that *to themselves* does not give clear sense. Comp., on the contrary, 1 Cor. vi. 16. We may adopt the second explanation, and yet the third need not be given up—namely, that in natural lewdness not only does one dishonor the other, but each dishonors himself.

Ver. 25. **They who exchanged the truth of God.** According to Meyer and Tholuck, Paul re-

* [Tholuck quotes from Lucan (*Phars.* viii. 83):

Nos in templa tuam Romana recipimus Isim
Semideosque canes.—P. S.]

† [παρέδωκε = εἴασε (Chrysostom), or = συνεχώρησε (Theodoret). This interpretation of the Greek fathers was followed by the rationalists, and is contrary to the meaning of the word (see Meyer). It explains nothing, for if God permits the sinner to sink deeper into vice, He does it, of course, with wise intention as a sovereign and righteous Judge.—P. S.]

* [Calov: "*Traditi sunt a Deo non* EFFECTIVE, *nec solum* PERMISSIVE, *nec tantum* ἐκβατικῶς, *sed* δικαστικῶς *et judicialiter.*" So Tholuck, Philippi, Alford ("not merely permissive, but judicial"). Meyer, stronger: "παρέδωκε expresses the *real active abandonment* (*die wirkliche active Preisgebung*) on the part of God." Both the Bible and daily experience teach that sin is punished by sin, as virtue is rewarded by virtue; and this is a Divinely instituted law in perfect harmony with our personal freedom and moral accountability; for man's will is in every act of sin as well as of obedience, and hence what is represented in one passage as the work of God, is in another passage just as properly represented as the work of man, comp. Eph. iv. 19: οἵτινες ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ, κ.τ.λ. God hardened Pharaoh's heart, Exod. vii. 13; ix. 12; x. 1, 20, 27; xi. 10; Rom. ix. 18, but Pharaoh first hardened his own heart, Exod. viii. 15, 32; ix. 34, 35, so that God punished him by his own sin. Comp. *Doctrinal and Ethical* No. 1.—P. S.]

turns expressly to the cause of the abandonment. But by this they overlook the definite progress of thought—namely, the argument for the abandonment of the second degree which follows in ver 26. As a punishment of the heathen for squandering the δόξα of God for the paltry sum of images, their own bodies have lost their δόξα. But they are further charged with bartering the truth of God for the lie of idolatry, since they have served the creature *παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα*. Therefore God gave them up to a *lie of sexual lust*, to a lust *παρὰ φύσιν*. It is from this parallel, which the commentators have overlooked, that exact exegetical definitions on this passage arise.—**They who exchanged,** *Οἵτινες, Quippe qui*. The expression denotes them as the same, but characterizes them more fully. The sense is, *they exchange for* (*sie tauschten um*), *μετήλλαξαν*, which is not merely "more emphatic" (Meyer) than ἤλλαξαν. It includes, with the exchange, a very strong conception of change, of variation.—**The truth of God.** Explanations: 1. The truth revealed to the Gentiles (Camerarius, Reiche, and others). 2. θεοῦ is *genit. object.*; therefore the true knowledge of God (Piscat., Usteri. [Alford: the true notion of Him as the Creator]). 3. θεοῦ is *genit. subject.*; the truth or reality of God, the true Divine essence, according to the analogy τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ (Tholuck, Meyer). Tholuck (with Theophylact, Luther, and others) takes it exactly as ἀληθινὸς θεός [and ψεῦδος for οἱ ψευδεῖς θεοί. So also Hodge: a periphrase for the true God—P. S.]. The δόξα of God is God's revelation in glory, and so is God's truth the φανέρωσις (see ver. 19) of his essential truth in the truthful relations of creation. The name of God is the revelation of His nature; not His nature in and of itself. But this revelation divides itself into the δόξα when we have in view the whole majesty of His name, and into the ἀλήθεια when we look at the real harmony of its antitheses. They have forsaken the general manifestation of this truth of God. They have, indeed, utterly squandered it for the gain of a mere lie—for the lying idols. [ψεῦδος = שֶׁקֶר, is used emphatically for idols in the Scriptures; Jer. xiii. 25; xvi. 19; Isa. xxviii. 15; xliv. 20; because the heathen gods do not even exist, and yet they are worshipped in the place of the only true God, who is the Cause of all existence, and the Author of all truth.—P. S.] Idols are lies not simply as *dii imaginarii* (Grotius). They are embodied lies. Man must make them, and they pretend to represent Him who made man (Isa. xl. 19, 20). They have mouths, but they speak not; eyes have they, but they see not (Ps. cxv. 5; cxxxv. 16; Wisdom xv. 15). The worshipper of idols has a dark consciousness of this contradiction. Even his worship is mendacious. Tholuck quotes Philo, *De Vita Mosis*, i. 3 [where it is said of the Israelites who had made the golden calf], Moses wondered ὅσον ψεῦδος ἀνθ' ὅσης ἀληθείας ὑπηλλάξαντο. Comp. also Isa. xliv. 20; Jer. iii. 10; xiii. 25: xvi. 19.—**And worshipped.** *Σεβάζομαι* [only once in the N. T.] denotes religious reverence in general; λατρεύω denotes worship [with sacrifice, and other acts and rites]. The conception of the σεβ. passes from fear and reverence to worship. Of kindred but not of identical character is the distinction of Theophylact, and others: internal and external worship.—**The creature rather than the Creator.** [κτίσει, *any created being or thing*, belongs to both verbs, but is conformed to λατρεύω as the nearest, while σεβάζομαι would require the accusative.—P. S.] The *παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα* has been interpreted in three ways: 1. *More* than the Creator [in the relative sense], (Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther [E. V. Grotius], and others); 2. *against* the Creator [*contra creatorem*; comp. *παρὰ φύσιν*, ver. 26], (Hammond, Fritzsche, and others); 3. In the sense of comparison [and exclusion], *præ creatore*, *præterito*, or *relicto creatore* (Hilarius, Theophylact, Beza, Tholuck, Meyer [Olshausen, De Wette, Philippi, Alford, Wordsworth, Hodge], and others). The third explanation is correct in the sense that it includes the second: Passing by one with the disregard and rejection of the same (see Luke xviii. 14). The *παρὰ φύσιν* in ver. 26 perfectly corresponds to this rendering. In both cases, the statement must not be understood absolutely; otherwise heathendom would have been the negation of all religion, and unnatural lust the negation of all propagation of the human race. It denotes the outbreaking sovereignty of a religious vice, which is completed in a sensual one. [Wordsworth derives from this text an argument against the Arians, who assert Christ to be a creature, and yet profess to worship Him; and against those who pay religious worship to any creature, since no one is to be worshipped, according to the Scriptures, who is not God by nature, and since there is no middle between Creator and creature.—P. S.]

Who is blessed forever. Tholuck: "The doxology is added to the name of God by Jews and Mohammedans when they must state something that is unworthy of Him, as though the writer would remove all suspicion of any share in the statement," &c. It is more natural to seek the explanation of this custom in the indignation of religious feeling, and in its confidence that God is exalted above the profanation of His name.* Tholuck informs us that an Arabian writer added, after every heresy which he mentioned: "God is exalted above all that they say!" The Apostle's expression, at all events, must not be regarded as a mere form, but as candid emotion (Meyer); which yet does not exclude the thought indicated above (Chrysostom, Grotius).—εὐλογητός, בָּרוּךְ.† **Who is blessed,** with reference to all future eternity, is likewise an expression of the confident expectation that *he shall be blessed* (Meyer therefore rejects, without good reason, the explanation of Fritzsche: *celebrandus*).

Ver. 26. **For this cause God gave them up.** The διὰ τοῦτο refers specifically to ver. 25, and takes its place with the διό of ver. 24 and the διότι of ver. 21 as a subdivision under ver. 18.

Unto shameful passions. The ἀτιμία was already in ver. 24, but now it becomes a passion. Meyer: *πάθη ἀτιμ.*, *genit. qual.* Since whoredom is also a shameful passion, the substantive must be retained: Passions of the shameful and degraded

* [So also Meyer (*Erguss der erregten Pietät*), Alford, and others. The doxology is the natural outburst of a holy indignation which puts the sin of idolatry in a more striking light and holds it up to the abhorrence of all pious minds. Comp. similar doxologies ix. 5; 1 Tim. i. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 18; comp. Gen. ix. 26; xiv. 20; xxiv. 27.—P. S.]

† [It is in the Bible only applied to God, while *μακάριος* and the corresponding Hebrew אַשְׁרֵי, *happy*, is applied to man, very rarely to God (only in two passages of the N. T., 1 Tim. i. 11; vi. 15). The E. V. renders *εὐλογητός* (and *εὐλογημένος*) always and properly *blessed*, but varies in its translation of *μακάριος* between *happy* and *blessed*; using the latter in those passages where spiritual happiness or the future glory of saints or the blessedness of God is intended, as Ps. i. 1; xxxii. 1; Luke i. 48; Matt. v. 3–11; 1 Tim. i. 11; vi. 15; Titus ii. 13.—P. S.]

condition. There was first a departure from honor to simple dishonor; then still further downward, to a passionate course of dishonor, which might almost be described as passion for vileness. The unnatural sins of lust rest upon unnatural passions, and these spring from the root of the unnatural, lying deification of creatures and images. Man is for God in a religious sense, as the man and woman are for each other in a moral point of view; this is the natural condition, the truth of the relations (Eph. v. 25). Therefore the perversion of nature, unnaturalness, or the lie of the service of the creature and of the idols, is punished by the perversion of nature, unnaturalness, or the lie of sexual gratification. Tholuck praises the modest reticence of the Apostle in the expression, although his expression is clear enough. He also says: "The self-degradation and self-condemnation of man appears most strikingly in the peculiarly (?) Grecian sin of pederasty (ἀρσενοκοῖται, 1 Cor. vi. 9), which, at the time when Paul wrote, was largely practised also in Rome. After Xenophon, *De Lacedæm. Republ.*, ii. 14, has mentioned that this vice was forbidden by Lycurgus, he adds, that this is not believed by some, ἐν πολλαῖς γὰρ τῶν πόλεων οἱ νόμοι οὐκ ἐναντιοῦνται ταῖς πρὸς τοὺς παῖδας ἐπιθυμίαις. Even the most distinguished men have incurred grave suspicions in this matter, some justly, others unjustly. Comp. Gessner, *De pæderastia Socratis* in *vet. diss. Gott.* ii. p. 125. Seneca, a contemporary of Paul, writes in Rome, *Ep.* 35: *Transeo puerorum infelicium greges, quos post transacta convivia aliæ cubiculi contumeliæ exspectant; transeo agmina exoletorum per nationes coloresque descripta.* The most hideous and yet the most accurate picture of Roman licentiousness at that time, is given by Petronius, a contemporary of the Apostle. Even women (called *tribades*) committed the same outrage, which was called by a smoother term after a famous predecessor in the crime, "Sapphic Love." [Seneca writes, *Ep.* 95: "*Libidine vero ne maribus quidem cedunt, pati natæ; dii illas deæque male perdant, adeo perversum commentæ genus impudicitiæ viros ineunt.*"]*

For even their women. Θήλειαι and ἄρσενες, instead of γυναῖκες and ἄνδρες, on account of the sexual reference. Reiche says erroneously: In a contemptuous sense, for description of the bestial. The expression χρῆσις is euphemistic for *usus venereus*, and therefore we must not supply τοῦ ἄρσενος, or τῆς θηλείας (Fritzsche). Tholuck explains thus: The Apostle places the female sex first, because the abomination of the crime is most horrible in *that* sex, whose noblest ornament is modesty (1 Tim. ii. 9) [similarly Hodge]. It may be observed, on the contrary, that the Apostle here generally passes from the less to the more abominable crime. He probably alludes, in ver. 26 (as Tholuck remarks), to the debauchery of the *tribades* (*frictrices*, "the Lesbian vice," λεσβιάζειν), where women commit abuses with women, but perhaps he included the more secret sin of onanism. This appears from the antithesis in ver. 27: Men *with men*. This sin is referred in a two-fold way to the deification of the creature: by μετήλλαξαν and by παρὰ φύσιν.

Ver. 27. **And likewise also the men.** The construction indicates that the unnatural burning (ἐκκαίεσθαι = πυροῦσθαι, 1 Cor. vii. 9) was inflamed by unnatural excitement in the shameful act itself. The κατεργαζόμενοι means the complete perpetration of the abomination.*—**Receiving in themselves the due reward of their error.** According to Ammon and others, the destructive consequences of lust. According to Tholuck, the self-degradation. According to Meyer, the designated lusts themselves, as the punishment for the πλάνη, vers. 21–23. [Alford and Hodge likewise refer the πλάνη to their departure from God into idolatry.—P. S.]. But the πλάνη is certainly the godless aberration into unnaturalness—that is, into a lie against nature, and we must think of the punishment as proportionate thereto; therefore not only the absolute self-deception, but also the shameful perversion of the sexual character (a man in a horrible way "the woman of all men"). Therefore, **in themselves**, not *through* themselves (Tholuck); nor "reciprocally" (Meyer). Meyer erroneously excludes here from consideration the destructive results of debauchery.

Ver. 28. **And as they did not deem it worth while** [οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν] **to retain God.** A further and more general development of *moral* corruption, based on a further and more general unfolding of religious corruption. Καθώς. The comparison is at the same time causal—which Tholuck denies. On the correspondence between the darkening of knowledge and practical corruption, see the quotations from the heathen writers, in Tholuck [and Wetstein. Cicero says, *De Nat. Deor.* 12: "*Ha d scio, an, pietate adversus Deos sublata, fides etiam et societas, et una excellentissima virtus justitia tollatur.*" The assertion of modern deists, rationalists, and infidels, that morality is independent of religion, is an idle delusion. The wise heathen knew better. Religion is the backbone of morality, and irreligion the mother of immorality and vice. He who is most true to God, is most true to himself and his fellow-men; and he who denies God, is not likely to recognize any binding obligation to man, except on purely selfish and utilitarian grounds. Immoral religionists and moral irreligionists are exceptions, and confirm the rule.—P. S.] The δοκιμάζειν = δόκιμον ἡγεῖσθαι [here, *to think it worthy*, or *worth while*; comp. 1 Thess. ii. 4; 1 Cor. xvi. 3].—**To retain God in** (their) **knowledge** [ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, *Erkenntniss*]. Tholuck makes the ἐπιγνώσκειν equal to the γινώσκειν in ver. 21. But here the question is concerning perception—that is, the *reception* of *knowledge* into the inner life. Besides, the ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει is stronger than γινώσκειν. Here again the punish-

* [Comp. the fearful and yet truthful description of the horrible vice of παιδεραστία among the highly civilised Greeks, in Döllinger's learned work: *Heidenthum und Judenthum*, 1857, p. 684 ff. "*Bei den Griechen*," he says, "*tritt das Laster der Päderastie mit allen Symptomen einer grossen nationalen Krankheit, gleichsam eines ethischen Miasma auf; es zeigt sich als ein Gefühl, das stärker und heftiger wirkte, als die Weiberliebe bei anderen Völkern, massloser, leidenschaftlicher in seinen Ausbrüchen war. Rasende Eifersucht, unbedingte Hingebung, sinnliche Gluth, zärtliche Tändelei, nächtliches Weilen vor der Thüre des Geliebten, Alles, was zur Carricatur der natürlichen Geschlechtsliebe gehört, findet sich dabei. Auch die ernstesten Moralisten waren in der Beurtheilung des Verhältnisses höchst nachsichtig, mitunter mehr als nachsichtig, sie behandelten die Sache häufig mehr mit leichtfertigem Scherze, und duldeten die Schuldigen in ihrer Gesellschaft. In der ganzen Literatur der vorchristlichen Periode ist kaum ein Schriftsteller zu finden, der sich entschieden dagegen erklärt hätte. Vielmehr war die ganze Gesellschaft davon angesteckt, und man athmete das Miasma, so zu sagen, mit der Luft ein.*"—P. S.]

* [Meyer: κατεργάζεσθαι is used in the good as well as the bad sense, but in distinction from ἐργάζεσθαι it always expresses the idea of carrying out, or completing.—P. S.]

ment corresponds to the guilt; therefore the ἀδόκιμος νοῦς is not a mind incapable of judgment or discernment [*judicii expers*], (Beza, Piscat. [Bengel]), but the adjective is passive, according to the use of language: worthless (good-for-nothing) mind. [δόκιμος, from δέχομαι, *receivable, worthy of reception;* ἀδόκιμος, *worthless, worthy of rejection.* The heathen did not lose the moral faculty of discerning between right and wrong, good and bad, but in spite of it they practised the bad, and encouraged its practice in others (ver. 32), thereby increasing their guilt. "It is the *video meliora proboque*, which makes the *deteriora sequor* so peculiarly criminal." —P. S.] The οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν and ἀδόκιμος νοῦς are a paronomasy. The νοῦς is the perceiving and deciding intelligence, and mediates all the impressions for moral self-determination and action.—**Things which are not becoming.** The μὴ καθήκοντα, in the technical sense of the philosophical schools, are things contrary to duty, or immoral; but in a more popular sense here, they are an expression of moral abhorrence.

Vers. 29–32. **Being filled with all unrighteousness.** Tholuck: "The accusatives πεπληρωμένους, μεστούς, &c., depend on ποιεῖν, as Erasmus has already remarked: *because* their thoughts are so impure, they also commit unbecoming things." [Some connect the following accusatives with αὐτούς of the preceding verse, so as to express the state in which, and the reason why, God abandoned them; but it is better to connect them with the subject of ποιεῖν, understood, so as to express the consequences of such abandonment, and the various forms of τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα which they practised. πᾶσα ἀδικία, all manner of immorality, is general; the following terms are specifications. Similar catalogues of sins: 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 19–21; Eph. v. 3; 1 Tim. i. 9, 10; 2 Tim. iii. 2–4. —P. S.] De Wette remarks that the following catalogue of sins, like a similar one in Gal. v. 19, is unsystematic; though ἀδικία stands first, as the principal conception. Likewise Tholuck (against Bengel's and Glöckler's attempts at classification) maintains that the Apostle states a "συναθροισμός [rhetorical accumulation] of manifestations of sin," and cites the paronomasies φθόνου and φόνου, ἀσυνέτους and ἀσυνθέτους. But the paronomasies are no proof, and so we attempt the following construction: *

I. *Vices.* The chief vice, ἀδικία, unrighteousness, at the head. This is divided into πονηρία, **malice** [disposition to inflict evil], wickedness—bold form; and into πλεονεξία, **avarice,** covetousness; κακία, **badness,** malice—pusillanimous form. On the addition of πορνεία to the above, see Textual Note [[11]]. The **expression** πεπληρωμένους means, that every **wicked person** had not merely one crime. By the vices are here meant permanent and cold traits of character, in distinction from deeds of impulse, in which the guilty persons appear as μεστοί, full and drunken.

II. *Evil deeds*, or *criminal acts.* The chief **sin,** φθόνος, **envy,** at the head; divided into φόνος, **murder;** ἔρις, **strife,** contention; δόλος, **deceit,** or fraud; κακοήθεια, **malignity,** treacherous conduct. The chief source is φθόνος; but in all these evil deeds they **appear** as drunken.

III. *Wicked characters* **according** to their *deeds.* ψιθυρισταί, **whisperers,** backbiters [one who slanders *secretly*]; καταλάλοι, **slanderers,** calumniators; θεοστυγεῖς, **haters of God,** despisers of God, scorning God (*Gottverächter*). Tholuck: Promethean characters. In the classic literature, and especially the tragic department, the word occurs only in the passive meaning: **hated by God,** hateful to God [see the quotations of Meyer *in loc.*]; but the context plainly declares in favor of the active rendering, which has been adopted by most commentators from Theodoret down to the present, and which alone is in harmony with the Christian spirit. Classic usage also favors the accessory thought: ungodly, wicked. ὑβρισταί, **insolent,** overbearing, those who perpetrate criminal ὕβρις; ὑπερήφανοι, those who are **proud,** self-conceited, those who conduct themselves arrogantly above others; ἀλαζόνες, **boasters,** who do not design, like the previous class, to crush others by the force of their greatness, but make a lying show of it; ἐφευρεταὶ κακῶν, **inventors of villanies,** or crimes, swindlers, and adventurers; γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, **disobedient to parents;** apostasy from the piety and affection due to parents is a fountain of corruption (see Malachi iv. 6; Luke i. 17). [Hodge: "That such should be included in this fearful list, shows the light in which filial disobedience is regarded by the sacred writers."—P. S.]

IV. (Ver. 31.) *Wicked characters* according to their *sentiments*, in leading psychological types. ἀσύνετοι, **without understanding** [or insight into moral things, blinded, besotted]; *corrupted intelligence;* ἀσύνθετοι, according to Philippi, and others, **quarrelsome,** implacable; according to Meyer, **covenant-breakers** [perfidious]; we construe the expression psychologically: *unstable*, unreliable—*corrupted will.* ἄστοργοι, **destitute of affection,** heartless; wanting even in natural feeling and natural love—*corrupted feeling.* (ἄσπονδοι, **implacable,** irreconcilable. Probably an insertion). ἀνελεήμονες, **unmerciful,** without pity and compassion: a totally corrupted state of feeling (Matt. xxv. 31 ff.).

V. *Wicked maxims* (ver. 32). Demoniacal pleasure in wickedness on the part of those who are conscious of the deadly guilt of sin (for example, heathen philosophers, magistrates, judges, etc.); and who not only commit sins worthy of death, but **also** approve them in others by their endorsement **and** principles.—The οἵτινες announces a new element, a new degree. This degree was of course not reached or thoroughly accomplished by all, but the generality were guilty to this degree—**a fact** which is shown by the crucifixion of Christ. Grotius has alluded to the defence of many crimes by the philosophers [*e. g.*, the defence of hatred, revenge, even pederasty and sodomy]; and Heumann [and Ewald] to lax criminal justice. The δικαί

* [The classification of Dr. Lange is certainly original and ingenious, and decidedly preferable to any other, although perhaps somewhat artificial. The next best classification is that of Bengel in Rom. i. 29: "*Tota enumeratio ordinem habet sapientem, per membra novem, in affectibus: duo, in sermone: tria, repectu Dei, et sui, et proximi; et duo, in rebus gerendis: sex, respectu necessitudinum.*" He also remarks that ἀδικία, the opposite of *justitia*, is put first, *immisericordia* last; justice has life, injustice death; ver. 32. But it seems to me that the Apostle, in this catalogue of vices, had regard not so much to systematic order, as to rhetorical effect, with the view to bring out more strikingly the absolute necessity of redemption. It is a rapid accumulation and rising climax to the crisis of the disease, which was the turning-point of the cure. Man's extremity was God's opportunity. Christ appeared "in the fulness of time," just when He was most needed, and when the way for His coming was fully prepared, both negatively by the hopeless corruption of society, and positively by the mission of the law and the promise in Israel, and the aspirations of the better class of heathen.—P. S.]

ωμα of God in the knowledge of the Gentiles is in part the institution of law and in part God's punitive dealing, so far as the latter is referred by the heathen conscience to Divine justice. [δικαίωμα (comp. Luke i. 6; Rom. ii. 26; viii. 4; Apoc. xv. 5, in the Septuagint often for the Hebrew מִצְוָה, חֻקָּה, חֹק) is here the righteous decree or sentence of God as the Lawgiver and Judge, declaring what is right and wrong, and connecting death with sin, and life with righteousness. Meyer: *Rechtsbestimmung;* Lange: *Rechtsurtheil;* Alford: *sentence;* Wordsworth and Hodge: *decree.* This decree is inscribed not only on the revealed law of the Old Testament, but also on the conscience or moral sense of every man. The latter is here meant.—P. S.]

Ver. 32. **Are worthy of death.** Photius: According to the Mosaic law. The Socinians: Civil punishment by death. Meyer: Eternal death, by which Paul has in mind the heathen notion of the state of punishment in Hades.* Fritzsche and De Wette: The misery of sin, and similar results. But the meaning is the general idea of death in the Gentile consciousness of guilt, as the punishment of the most varied forms of sin. [Alford: θάνατος, a general term for the *fatal* consequence of sin; that such courses *lead to ruin.* Hodge: All evil inflicted for the satisfaction of justice. This passage shows that the judicial abandonment of God does not destroy the free agency or responsibility of men. The stream which carries them away is not without, but within; it is their own corrupt nature. Umbreit: Life and death are ever set over against one another in the Old and New Testaments, the one as including all good, the other as all evil.—P. S.] The πράσσειν is a stronger expression. [It brings out more clearly the idea of repetition and continuance of action than ποιεῖν.—P. S.]

The progress is very apparent from wicked passions to wicked acts; from these, to wicked characters, according to the positive methods of action; from these, to wicked characters in whom the inclination for what is good is extinguished; and from these, finally, to wicked maxims. This progress is also expressed by the change of the forms. The same sins are not described throughout these different categories. According to the fundamental conception of unrighteousness, the first category may be regarded as the general category. The second describes sins against our fellow-men in their individual relation; the third, those against human society; the fourth passes on to settle the character of self-corruption in its psychological forms of sentiment; and the fifth, to the complete demoniacal consciousness and approval of sin.

[This dark picture of heathen corruption (which does not exclude honorable exceptions; comp. Rom. ii. 14, 26) is by no means overdrawn, and can be fully verified by testimonies from the first writers of the classical age of ancient Greece and Rome, such as Thucydides (iii. 82–84, on the moral state of Greece during the Peloponnesian war), Aristophanes, Horace, Catullus, Juvenal, Persius, Sallust, Seneca, Tacitus, Suetonius. Comp. my *Church History*, vol. i. p. 302 ff., and the works quoted there. I shall only refer to a passage from Seneca, the philosopher and contemporary of Paul, *De Ira*, ii. 8: "All is full of crime and vice; there is more committed than can be healed by punishment. A monstrous prize contest of wickedness is going on The desire to sin increases, and shame decreases day by day. . . . Vice is no longer practised secretly, but in open view. Vileness gains in every street and in every breast to such an extent, that innocence has become not only rare, but has ceased to exist." It is true, the history of Christian countries often presents a similar picture of moral corruption (with the exception of those unnatural vices described vers. 26 and 27, which have almost disappeared, or greatly diminished within the pale of Christian civilization). Think of the state of the Latin Christians in the fifth century as described by the priest Salvianus, who charges them with every vice, and puts them, in a moral point of view, beneath the barbarians; of the condition of Catholic France under Louis XIV. and XV.; and of the large capitals of Europe and America in our days. Yea, in some respects the most diabolical forms of sin are brought out by contrast under the Christian dispensation, and apostasy from Christianity is worse than heathenism (comp. 2 Tim. iii. 1–9). But there remains this radical difference: the heathen corruptions were produced and sanctioned by the heathen mythology and idolatry; while Christian nations are corrupt in spite of and in direct opposition to Christianity, which raises the highest standard of virtue, and acts continually on the world as a purifying and sanctifying power.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The revelation of God's salvation is at the same time a revelation of *God's wrath.* One conception is eclipsed by the other. It is a vain delusion to imagine that we can separate the doctrine of redemption from that of wrath. The conception of wrath is the conception of the *absolute* and *personal energy* of the Divine government of love in punitive righteousness. Redeeming love is the absolute and personal energy of Divine righteousness in the saving exercise of love. Can a soul enjoy the experience of salvation by faith, without passing through an internal judgment, and feeling of Divine displeasure? For further information, see the *Exeg. Notes;* Tholuck, pp. 56, 57; Meyer, p. 49; the article *Zorn Gottes*, in Herzog's *Realencyklopädie* [vol. xviii. p. 657 ff.], together with the literature on the subject enumerated there [especially the monograph on the Wrath of God by Ferdinand Weber, with prolegomena on the doctrine of the atonement by Franz Delitzsch, Erlangen, 1862.—P. S.]

2. The essential characteristic of all forms of *unbelief* consists in men's holding back or hindering the truth in *unrighteousness.* "Modern culture" attempts to separate the ideas ἀπιστία and ἀπείθεια utterly from each other. But the biblical view will not allow such a separation. Unbelief is misconduct toward the moral claims within the horizon of the internal life. This misconduct has its degrees. The germ and principle is sin as transgression (παράβασις) in general. The definite determination is apostasy, which manifests itself also as opposition to Divine truth. Therefore the two fundamental forms of specific unbelief are: apostasy, and hostile attack. The third degree is hardness of heart. But the measure of power in human obstacles to the revelation of God is related to the power

* [Philippi likewise refers to the heathen myth of Hades with its punishments, and quotes from Æschylus, *Eumenid.* vv. 259–265.—P. S.]

of Divine reaction against these obstacles, just as the power of man (as weakness) is related to the omnipotence of God.

3. The idea of the *revelation of God by nature* pervades the entire Bible. See Ps. viii., xix., civ., and others; Isa. xl. According to Schneckenburger (*Beiträge zur Einleitung in's Neue Testament*, 10th essay: *Paul's Natural Theology, and its Sources*), Philo was Paul's source. See thereon, Tholuck, p. 64. The pamphlet of Hebart also belongs here: *Die natürliche Theologie des Apostels Paulus* (Nürnb., 1860); likewise Zöckler's *Theologia Naturalis*, or *Entwurf einer systematischen Naturtheologie*. [Frankfurt a. M., 1860, 2 vols.] The latter has viewed natural theology in a more primitive than usual sense. We must bear in mind that natural theology, since the revelation of salvation, has assumed a different form from what it had before the revelation of salvation, and especially as the basis of the original revelation. The symbolical natural religion which prevailed down to Abraham is distinguished from the revelation of salvation herein, that God revealed Himself there specially by symbols and signs, but here by the Word. See also the article *Raymond of Sabunde*, in Herzog's *Real-encyklopädie* [vol. xii. p. 571].

4. According to Paul, as according to all the Holy Scriptures, humanity has *fallen* from its original ideal height; but according to the majority of those who set themselves up as the advocates of "modern culture," it has risen from a rough, beast-like state. Wherefore Reiche also (p. 157) has expressed the opinion that the Apostle has here expressed only a cotemporary opinion of the Jews. The testimony of history is against the view of "modern culture." It proves the gradual decay of the Hindus, the Arabians, the Ethiopians, the Indians, and, finally, even of the Greco-Roman world, with all its relative glory.

5. It is improper to regard the description of the Apostle as a description only of the corruption of the heathen world. It *shows us first how the Gentile world arose*, and then *what became of it;* but it does not *commence* with a *Gentile world*. Therefore it goes back, fundamentally, to the genesis of sin in the fall of man; but then it shows how the fall of man in its second form (with the self-boasting of man after the flood) became the *genesis* of real *heathendom*. The corruption arose from the original symbolical religion which prevailed from Adam down to Abraham. For men magnified the simple symbolism of nature—which God had given—by their own arbitrary symbolizations, and then mythicized the symbols; that is, they deified them. Thus mythology arose from symbolism, and idolatry and then image-worship arose from the symbolical view of nature. Recent research has commenced to exhume from the ruins of myths the gold of the original symbolism. Comp. my treatise *On the Relation between General and Ecclesiastical Symbolism*, in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christliche Wissenschaft*, &c., 1855, Nos. 4–6; and the recent writings on heathendom by Wuttke [*Geschichte des Heidenthums*, 1852 ff.], Döllinger [*Heidenthum und Judenthum*, 1851], Stiefelhagen, Lasaulx, and others. [Schelling, *Philosophie der Mythologie*, 1857; Fabri, *Die Entstehung des Heidenthums*, 1859; Nägelsbach on the *Homeric*, and *Post-Homeric Theology*, 1840, 1857; Gladstone, *Studies on Homer*, 1858; W. S. Tyler, *The Theology of the Greek Poets*, 1867.—P. S.]

6. The description of the original form of natural religion does not justify the conclusion that the revelation of God in Christ would not have occurred under the presupposition of human righteousness. But it leads us to conclude that the progress from the one to the other would have been effected in the form of a historical continuity.

7. The explanation of Gentile corruption from the great *peccatum omissionis*. "They have not honored and thanked God" (ver. 21); this is a penetrating glance which sheds its light also upon the first fall, as well as upon every genesis of sin. On the significance of this passage for the whole Epistle, see the Introduction and the *Exeg. Notes*.

8. God's positive government, which impels evil through trial and temptation into the process of development *from* righteous judgment (sin punished by sin) and *to* righteous judgment (Rom. xi. 32), corresponds with God's negative abandonment, in which the first ground for the punishment is revealed, not only because God, as the Holy One, must withdraw His Spirit from the consciousness of sinful man, but also because He regards man in his freedom, and leaves him to its action (see my *Positive Dogmatics*, p. 468).

[*Sin punished by sin.* The Rabbinical tract, *Pirke Aboth*, c. 2, ver. 1, says: "*Festina ad præceptum leve tanquam ad grave, et fuge transgressionem; præceptum enim trahit præceptum, et transgressio transgressionem; quia merces præcepti præceptum est, et transgressionis transgressio.*' Seneca (Ep. 16): "The first and greatest punishment of any commission of sin is the sin itself which is committed." De Wette, ad Rom. i. 24: "This view (that sin is punished by sin) is no mere Jewish doctrine, but it is universally true from the absolute standpoint of religion." Schiller:

> "This is the very curse of evil deed,
> That of new evil it becomes the seed."

But this judicial punishment of sin with sin does not make God the author of sin in any sense. Dr. South (Serm. ii. on 2 Thess. ii. 11) says: "God may make one sin the punishment of another, though it still is to be remembered that it is one thing for God to *give a man over to sin*, and quite another for God to cause him to sin; the former importing in it no more than God's providential ordering of a man's circumstances, so that he shall find no check or hinderance in the course of his sin; but the latter implying also a positive efficiency toward the commission or production of a sinful act; which God never does, nor can do; but the other He both may, and, in a judicial way, very often does. . . . In all which God is not at all the author of sin, but only pursues the great work and righteous ends of His providence, in disposing of things or objects in themselves good or indifferent, toward the compassing of the same; howbeit, through the poison of men's vicious affections, they are turned into the opportunities and fuel of sin, and made the occasion of their final destruction; ix. 17, 22." Dr. Hodge: "God often punishes one sin by abandoning the sinner to the commission of others. Paul repeats this idea three times, vers. 24, 26, 28. This judicial abandonment is consistent with the holiness of God and the free agency of man. God does not impel or entice to evil. He ceases to restrain. He says of the sinner, Let him alone; vers. 24–28."—P. S.]

9. The deep truth in the proof of the connection between religious and moral corruption.

10. The intimate connection between the denial of the δόξα of God and the degradation of the δόξα of the human form by whoredom, and between the

denial of the *truth* of God and the degradation of the true relations of human nature, as represented by Paul, has not been properly observed. See *Exeg. Notes*.

11. Other enumerations of sins and crimes in the Scriptures: see 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 19; Eph. v. 3; 1 Tim. i. 9; 2 Tim. iii. 2.

12. Sin reaches its climax in wicked maxims and principles. They are demoniacal in their character, and the intellectual side of the service of the devil, which may be known not only in its gross forms, but also in the subtle form of cowardly idolatry of what is base, and which in this shape is widely diffused. [Yet, even in the most reprobate sinner, the voice of conscience cannot be entirely extinguished ("*knowing the judgment of God*," ver. 32). It makes him uneasy and miserable on earth, and will be his condemnation in the other world.—P. S.]

13. While the Apostle has here described the dark side of heathendom, the second chapter shows that the whole of heathendom does not appear to him under this dark aspect. In the first chapter he describes the prevailing Antinomian tendency of heathendom, in opposition to the prevailing legalistic tendency of Judaism.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 18–21.

In what does the beginning of all the real sinful corruption of the world, and of the Gentiles in particular, consist? 1. In the neglect of the general manifestations of God by creation; 2. in neglect to worship God by praise and thanksgiving.—Against what will God's wrath be sent from heaven? 1. Against all ungodliness; 2. against all unrighteousness of men who hold back the truth in unrighteousness (ver. 18).

The revelation of *wrath*, and the revelation of *love*, as they, 1. Are opposed to each other; 2. are closely connected with each other.—The revelation of God in nature is a revelation of His invisible nature—that is, of His eternal power and Godhead (vers. 19, 20).—He who knows God, should praise and thank Him.—The knowledge and worship of God.—Neglect of the worship of God leads to obscuring the knowledge of God (ver. 21).

Luther: Where there is no faith, reason falls from one depth to another, until it is totally blinded in its speculations, as is the case with all self-conceited and heated brains (ver. 21).

Starke: Even after the fall, every man has a natural knowledge of the nature and works of God; yet this is not sufficient to lead him to salvation (ver. 19).—God esteems our knowledge according to the means we have of obtaining it. Thus He demands more knowledge from the Jews than from the Gentiles, and still more from us Christians (ver. 21).—As God is a living God, so must our knowledge of Him also be vital, and express itself in praise and thanks (ver. 21).—Langii *Op. Bibl.:* Whoever denies the wrath of God, and describes God alone according to mere love, thereby obscures also the greatness of the grace and love of God, and leads others to despise this grace and love (ver. 18).—Hedinger: God does not leave Himself without a witness among the heathen. All creatures eloquently testify to His might and wisdom (ver. 20). From Quesnel: *Hugo de Area: Omnis creatura tribus vocibus nobis loquitur: prima est famulantis, accipe beneficium; secunda admonentis, redde debitum servitium; tertia comminantis, fuge supplicium* (ver. 20).

Bengel: Whatever is under heaven, and not under the gospel, is under the wrath (ver. 18).—The heart of man conforms to its thoughts (ver. 21).

Gerlach: The sin against which God's wrath is directed shows itself in the double form of *ungodliness* and *unrighteousness*, according as man sins more directly against God, or against himself and his neighbor (ver. 18).—As soon as man ceases to direct himself to the *holy* and *gracious* God, he worships only God's *power* and *beauty* (?), and makes *Nature* his God (ver. 21).

Heubner: The denial of God can never be excused, for man can know God (ver. 19).

The Pericope for the 11th Sunday after Trinity (vers. 16–20).—Heubner: The joy of the Christian in the confession of faith: 1. Disposition; 2. necessity; 3. how are we fitted for it?—How shall we learn to estimate properly the value of the gospel? 1. When we experience its power in our own hearts; 2. when we perceive properly the wretched condition of the human race without Christianity—its religious as well as its moral condition; 3. when we learn the insufficiency of natural religion, which reveals God's existence and power, but not His mercy toward sinners.—The relation of natural and revealed religion: 1. Harmony; 2. difference; 3. inferences.

Lange: *For* the wrath of God. Wrath a proof of the gospel: 1. Of its necessity; 2. its truth; 3. its glory.—On the difference between the knowledge and perception of God.—The general manifestation of God, or the relation between natural religion and revealed religion in its narrower sense.—The beginning of all sin is always at bottom a sin of neglect.—The two sides of piety: to praise God, and to thank Him.

[Tillotson: Vers. 18, 19. If it were only the wrath and displeasure of men that the sinner were exposed to, there might be reason enough for fear but the wrath and vengeance of men bears no comparison with the wrath of God. Their arm is short, and their power small; they may shoot their most poisonous arrows at us, and at last kill us; but they cannot pursue us into the other world. But the wrath of God has none of these limits.—*The fear of God's wrath:* Men may harden their foreheads, and conquer all sense of shame; but they cannot perfectly stifle and subdue their fears. They can hardly so extinguish the fear of hell, but that some sparks of that fire will ever and anon be flying about in their consciences.—South (sermon on *Natural Religion without Revelation, sufficient to render a sinner inexcusable* (ver. 20): I heartily wish that all young persons would lodge this one observation deep in their minds: That God and nature have joined wisdom and virtue by such a near cognation, or, rather, such an inseparable connection, that a wise, prudent, and honorable old age is seldom or never found but as the reward and effect of a sober, virtuous, and well-spent youth.—Scott: Even to this day, if any nations seem to be sunk into so entire a stupidity as to have no notions of a God remaining among them, this still more clearly proves, not man's want of rational powers, but his carnal enmity to God and religion, through which he becomes more and more the besotted and blind slave of Satan.—Clarke: Paul's purpose is to show: 1. That all the heathen nations are utterly corrupt, and

deserving of punishment; 2. that the Jews, notwithstanding the greatness of their privilege, were no better than the Gentiles.—HODGE: The folly and darkness of which the Apostle here speaks are expressive of want of Divine knowledge, which is but the effect and cause of moral depravity.—J. F. H.]

VERS. 22–32.

Abandonment of the Gentile world: 1. Why did God abandon them? *a.* Because they changed His glory into something transitory and corruptible; *b.* His truth into a lie. 2. In what respect did God abandon them? *a.* In pollution of the flesh and spirit; *b.* in utter hardness of heart (vers. 22–32).—How dreadful to be abandoned by God! Because 1. His Spirit departs; 2. sin becomes punishment.—Has Paul described the moral pollution of the Gentile world in too dark colors? No. For what the Apostle says is corroborated by witnesses from its very midst. 1. Of ancient times (Aristophanes, Horace, Juvenal); 2. of the present day (modern Hindu literature, &c.).—He who would describe sin, must be strengthened by looking up to God (ver. 25).—The heathen world of the present day is the same as that at the time of Paul, and therefore can be converted only by the same means (the gospel).—He who knows how to do good, and does not do it, sins (ver. 32).—What men are hardened? Those who (1) know God's righteousness, (2) yet do what deserves death, and (3) are not contented to have pleasure in those who do it (ver. 32).

LUTHER: The real Epicureans are those who live as if there were no God; who boast much, and would have others boast of them that they are something extraordinary, when they really are not (ver. 30).

STARKE: It was a crime of pride, when they said, We are not so foolish (ver. 22).—To consider one's self wise and shrewd, and yet to possess foolish *principia*, is the greatest folly; especially when exhibited by the world's wise men in published writings (ver. 22).—The wisest and most learned are often also the most perverted.—It is absolutely unreasonable to worship God under the image of a beast; for what king, prince, and honorable man would permit himself to be represented in the form of an ox, or hog (!). How much less can God be treated thus (ver. 23).—He who forsakes God, will be forsaken also by God (ver. 24).—The most direct path to atheism, is to regard God unworthy to be known (ver. 28).—Goodness goes gently, but evil goes violently, and will be host in the house. It foams and ferments like new wine (ver. 29).—HEDINGER: Sin is sometimes the punishment of sin (ver. 24).—OSIANDER *Bibl.*: Teachers and preachers must be careful to speak of sins against God and nature in such a way that those sins be prevented and guarded against, rather than learned and committed (ver. 26).—CRAMER: Although the neglect to know God is regarded by the world as no sin, or, if a sin, the least of all, it is really a fountain of all sin, and, finally, of all the penalties consequent upon sin (ver. 28).

HEUBNER: The ruin of the Gentile world is a warning for Christians: Apostasy from the word of God induces similar aberrations at all times—a new though more refined heathenism (ver. 22).—God forsakes only those who will not hear Him (ver. 24).—A wicked state of heart leads to absolute pleasure in wickedness itself (ver. 32).

BESSER: Unnaturalness follows from the deification of nature (ver. 27).

LANGE: The connection between religious and moral ruin is exhibited also in the world at the present time.—The barbarous disregard of the human person in all sexual sins, as often concealed beneath the most refined masks of culture, is closely connected with the irreligious disregard of the personality of God and man.—A fundamental sanctification of the sexual relations can arise only from the vital knowledge of the dignity of personal life.—Sin taking on the form of the devilish nature in wicked maxims.

[SCOTT: Religion moderates and regulates natural affections, but excess of depravity extinguishes them. It is a proof of more determined impiety for men to take pleasure in the company of the enemies of God, than to commit many crimes whilst the heart and conscience protest against them.—CLARKE: We see what the world was, and what it would ever have been, had not God sent a divine revelation of His will, and established a public ministry to proclaim it. Were man left to the power and influence of his fallen nature, he would always be what the Apostle here describes as the condition of the Gentile world. —*Comprehensive Comm.*: No wickedness so heinous, but a reprobate mind will comply.

HODGE (condensed): 1. It is the very nature of sin to be inexcusable, and worthy of punishment; 2. as the works of God reveal His eternal power and Godhead, we should accustom ourselves to see in them the manifestations of His perfections; 3. the human intellect is as erring as the human heart; 4. as the light of nature is insufficient to lead the heathen to God and holiness, it is our obvious and urgent duty to send them the light of the Bible; 5. sins of uncleanness are peculiarly debasing and demoralizing; 6. to take pleasure in those who do good, makes us better; as to delight in those who do evil, is the surest way to become even more degraded than they are themselves.—Compare two sermons by R. SOUTH on *The Heinous Guilt of Taking Pleasure in Other Men's Sins;* and sermon by C. GIRDLESTONE on *Pleasure in the Sight of Sin* (*Parochial Sermons*).—J. F. H.]

[Ver. 32. SOUTH (Sermon on the text): That sin (which sympathizes with and patronizes the sinner) is a pitch beyond all other sins, and such an one as must nonplus the devil himself to proceed farther. It is the very extremity, the fulness, and the concluding period of sin; the last line and finishing stroke of the devil's image, drawn upon the soul of man.—P. S.]

THIRD SECTION.—*Gradual transition from the corruption of the Gentiles to that of the Jews. The universality of the corruption, and, with the universality of guilt, that worst corruption, the judgment of others. This judgment is likewise judged by the continuance of a universal antagonism, within the universal corruption, between pious, earnest men, and obstinate rebels, both among Gentiles and Jews, in view of the righteous, impartial government of God by virtue of the continuance of the universal legislation of God in the conscience. The revelation of the antagonism of loyal Gentiles and disloyal Jews on the day of the proclamation of the gospel.*

CHAP. II. 1-16.

1 Therefore [Wherefore] thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art
that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another [the other, thy neighbor, *τὸν
ἕτερον*], thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things.
2 But we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth against them
3 which [those who] commit such things. And [But] thinkest thou this, O man,
that judgest them which do [those who practise] such things, and doest the
4 same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despisest thou the
riches of his goodness and forbearance and long-suffering; not knowing [not
considering] that the goodness of God leadeth [is leading] thee to repentance?
5 But, after thy hardness and impenitent heart, treasurest up unto [for] thyself
wrath against [in] the day of wrath [1] and revelation [2] of the righteous judgment
of God;
6, 7 Who will render to every man according to his deeds: To them [those]
who by patient continuance in well-doing [by endurance in good work] seek
for glory and honour and immortality [will he render, ἀποδώσει, ver. 6], eternal life: [3]
8 But unto them that [to those who] are contentious [self-seeking, or partisans],
and do not obey [disobey] the truth, but obey unrighteousness, [shall be rendered]
9 indignation and wrath [wrath and indignation],[4] Tribulation and anguish, [*omit* ,]
upon every soul of man that doeth evil [is working out to the end the evil,
τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν], of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile;
10 [Greek.] But glory, honour, and peace, to every man that worketh good [is
working the good, *τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν*], to the Jew first, and also to the
11 Gentile [Greek]. For there is no respect of persons [5] with [before] God.
12 For as many as have [*omit* have] sinned without law shall [will] also perish
without law; and as many as have [*omit* have] sinned in [under] the law shall
13 [will] be judged by the law; [.] (For not the hearers of the law [6] [of law]
are just [righteous] before God, but the doers of the law [of law] shall [will]
14 be justified [declared righteous]. For when [whenever] the [*omit* the] [7] Gentiles,
which have not the law [Gentiles having no law, *ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα*], do [8]
by nature the things contained in the law [the things of the law, *τὰ τοῦ νόμου*,
i. e., the things pertaining to, or required by, the law], these, having not the law [not having
15 (the) law, *νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες*],[9] are a law unto [to] themselves: Which [Who]
shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing
witness, and *their* thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one
another;) [*their* thoughts between one another, or alternately, *μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων*,
16 accusing or also, *ἢ καί*, excusing.] [10] In the day when God shall judge the
secrets of men by [through] Jesus Christ according to my gospel.

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 5.—[*ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς*, *i. e.*, wrath which will be revealed in the day of wrath. It belongs to *ὀργήν*, not to *θησαυρίζεις*. The E. V. confounds *ἐν* with *εἰς*, which is inadmissible, unless we take it as a *constructio pregnans*, so that *ἐν* includes *εἰς*.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 5.—*καί* after *ἀποκαλύψεως* is nowise sustained either by the Codd. or by the connection. [Probably inserted to relieve the number of genitives. Meyer: The *καί* would make the sense: the appearance *of God* and His righteous judgment. But the term *ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ θεοῦ* is unusual. Paul speaks only of the *ἀποκ. Χριστοῦ*, 1 Cor. i. 7; 2 Thess. i. 7.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 7.—[On the different constructions see the *Exeg. Notes*.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 8.—The *rec.* *θυμὸς καὶ ὀργή*. [The reverse order is intrinsically preferable and sustained by ℵ. A. B D*. G. Vulg. Syr., &c., and adopted by the critical editors. The change in the construction from the accusative *ζωὴν αἰώνιον* (*ἀποδώσει*), ver. 7, to the nominative *ὀργὴ καὶ θυμός* (*ἀποδώσεται* or *ἔσται*), ver. 8, is no doubt intentional

God gives eternal life, and wills all men to be saved; but condemnation is man's own guilt, and comes, so to speak, *Deo nolente*. Comp. Œcumenius, Wordsworth, Hodge, and Forbes *in loc.* Bengel, on Matt. vii. 24, says: "*Salutaria Deus ad se refert; mala a se removet.*"—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 11.—[Literally, *acceptance of faces.* For προσωποληψία, several Codd. (A. D. G. and Sinaiticus) read προσωποληµψία, with an µ, and this reading has been adopted by Lachmann, Alford, and others here and elsewhere (Acts x. 34; James ii. 9) The insertion of a µ is probably Alexandrian usage, and due to a vicious pronunciation of β and π.—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 13.—The article [before νόµου in both cases, which is found in the *text. rec.*] is wanting in A. B. D. E. [and in Cod. Sin., and is probably inserted to indicate that the written law of Moses is meant here. Nevertheless the article before *law* may be properly retained in the E. V. Alford proposes to omit the article before *hearers*, and *doers*, since it in both cases is generic. οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόµου and οἱ ποιηταὶ νόµου form properly one word: *Gesetzeshörer*, *Gesetzesthäter* law-hearers, law-doers.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 14.—[ἔθνη, not τὰ ἔθνη. The omission of the article is important to avoid the appearance of conflict with the general moral depravity of the heathen, as taught i. 22 ff.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 14.—[Dr. Lange translates . *etwa thun*, and so renders the force of the subjunctive ποιῶσιν, which is better attested (א. A. B.) than the indicative ποιοῦσιν, and is adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford. Others read the singular ποιῇ with reference to the neutral plural ἔθνη (Meyer, Wordsworth).—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 14.—[There is, as Meyer remarks, a difference of emphasis between µὴ νόµον ἔχ. and νόµον µὴ ἔχ.; the first denies the possession of the *law*, the second the *possession* of the law. This difference can perhaps best be rendered in English by: *having no law*, and, *not having the law*.—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 15.—[The inward monitor of the heathen condemns or acquits their moral conduct. The καί after ἤ is concessive, and implies that the acquittal is the exception, the condemnation the rule. µεταξὺ ἀλλήλων must not be separated, and µεταξὺ is to be taken not as adverb, as in the E. V., but as preposition, *inter se, between one another, invicem, alternately*; comp. Acts xv. 9: διέκρινε µεταξὺ ἡµῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν; Matt. xviii. 15: µεταξὺ σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ. The ἀλλήλων may refer either to the ἔθνη, as the preceding αὐτῶν (Meyer, Lange), or to the following τῶν διαλογισµῶν, *i. e.* thought against thought in inner strife. See *Exeg. Notes.* Omit the parenthesis vers. 13, 14, and 15 (E. V.), or of 14 and 15 (Lachmann, Meyer), which only disturbs the connection. See *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 16.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary.—These are the parts of this highly important section: 1. Every judgment pronounced on another becomes the self-condemnation of the one judging; for he is in the same condemnation with the one who is judged by him. Herein the sin of the Jews is already presupposed (vers. 1–5). 2. The righteousness of God is exalted above all partial righteousness; and in its retribution it distinguishes between men who earnestly long after righteousness, and those who obstinately resist; between men who constantly look toward things eternal, and those whose principle of life is contention and party spirit (vers. 6–11). This opposition constitutes a higher ideal and dynamic opposition between pious and ungodly people above the historical antagonism of Jews and Gentiles, and independently of it, so that, on the day of the declaration of the gospel, Jews may appear as Gentiles, and Gentiles as Jews (vers. 12–16).

First Paragraph, vers. 1–5.

Ver. 1. **Wherefore thou art inexcusable.** It may be asked, To what does διὸ, **wherefore,** refer? 1. To the fundamental thought of the whole section of chap. i. 18–32 (Meyer, and others). 2. διό refers back to the δικαίωµα in ver. 32 (De Wette, Philippi [Alford, Hodge]). 3. διό points proleptically to the sins of the Jews (Bengel, Tholuck). We need hardly mention Bullinger's explanation: It is *continuationis particula; præterea.* We here find a definite reference to chap. i. 32. The οἵτινες indicates chiefly the climax of Gentile corruption; but Gentile and Jewish corruption meet together at this climax. Gentile corruption culminates in the approval of evil, and Jewish in judging. But their common corruption is the perfect moral self-contradiction: sin against better knowledge and conscience. Therefore ἀναπολόγητοι, **inexcusable,** are not merely those who contribute aid to evil-doers, but those also who pronounce sentence on them. In other words, not the διό, but ver. 32 is proleptic, especially in connection with the ἀνελεήµονες in ver 31.

O man, whosoever thou art. To whom is this address directed? 1 To the *Gentiles*, especially Gentile authorities (Chrysostom); their better-minded ones (Olshausen, Melanchthon); their philosophers (Clericus). 2. The *Jews* (De Wette, Rückert, and others). Meyer: "Judging the Gentiles as rejected by God (*Midr. Tillin* f. 6, 3; *Chetubb.* f. 3, 2, &c.) was a *characteristicum* of the Jews. [Alford: The Jew is not yet named, but hinted at.—P. S.] 3. *All* men, without distinction (Beza, Calovius). 4. All men, but with a special reference to the Jews (Tholuck).* The last interpretation must be rendered more definite by the consideration that the merciless among Jews and Gentiles are meant. But, in reality, every one is meant who makes himself guilty of condemnatory judgment (for this is the sense of κρίνειν, here, as in Matt. vii. 1; xxv. 35). See vers. 9, 10. The Gentiles, too, were heartless judges. We need call to mind only Roman politics. Tholuck recalls the corruption of Jewish life at that time under Herod, and even among their scribes.—Ἐν ᾧ, **wherein,** is explained in ver. 21 sqq., and hence must not be understood as instrumental, *by which means, whereby;* still less *eodem tempore quo, at the time when* (Köllner), but *in that wherein, in the matter in which* (Luther [E. V., Meyer, Alford], and others). **[Thou that judgest doest the same things,** τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πράσσεις ὁ κρίνων Uncharitable judging is itself a grave offence against the law which enjoins humility and charity as the very soul of virtue and piety. Besides, even the most moral men carry in themselves the seed of all vices, and if kept from open transgression, it is either by the grace of God preventing them, or by (Pharisaic and Stoic) pride, which is itself a sin against God, the sin of Satan and the fallen angels.—P. S.] The addition of ὁ κρίνων, "with reproachful expression" (Meyer).

Ver. 2. **But we are sure,** Οἴδαµεν. Who? 1. The Jews, as knowers of the law (Rosenmüller, and others).† 2. Universal human knowledge (Rück-

* [Similarly Hodge: Though from what follows it is plain that the Jews are here intended, yet the proposition is made general. Wordsworth: Paul uses ἄνθρωπε instead of Ἰουδαῖε, because the proposition is of universal application, and because he would approach the Jew with gentleness, and not alienate him by an abrupt denunciation.—P. S.]

† [Wordsworth: We who are Jews and have the Scriptures. The Apostle charitably and wisely identifies himself with the Jews to convince them from the conceded ground of the O. T.—P. S.]

ert, Meyer, Philippi [Hodge]). 3. Jewish-Christian knowledge, with reference to chap. iii. 19; vii. 14 (Tholuck). 4. Yet the consciousness here declared is the specifically Christian one, which is, however, anticipated by the better universal consciousness in forebodings of the common misery of sin.

According to truth. Κατὰ ἀλήθειαν, not ἀληθῶς [*revera, truly*] (Raphel, Köllner, it is *real*), but [as in E. V.] according to truth (Tholuck, Meyer [Alford]); that is, corresponding to the internal and real relations of guilt [according to justice, without error, without respect of persons]. The condemnatory judgment of God on those who judge is according to the relations of truth, by which judgment they are the most condemnable who, without knowing it, pronounce judgment on themselves. Therefore they are hypocrites. [Κατὰ ἀλήθειαν belongs not to κρίμα, as the predicate of the sentence, but to ἐστίν, as adverb: it proceeds according to truth, or the judgment of God, which is according to truth, is against those, &c.—P. S.]

Ver. 3. **And thinkest thou this, O man.** According to Meyer and Tholuck, ver. 2 is the *propositio major* in relation to what here follows. If the Apostle had designed such a *conclusion* in ver. 5, the minor proposition of vers. 3 and 4 would have been otherwise expressed. We have here the beginning of the conclusion from the premise in ver. 2. Thinkest thou *that*, τοῦτο. Reference to the strange supposition that God will become, by way of exception, a partisan for him. Therefore also the σύ is emphasized. Meyer: "In opposition to Jewish conceit." Matt. iii. 7; Luke iii. 7. Yet the expression here must not be limited to the Jews.—**That thou** [σύ, thou thyself, thou above all others, thou because a Jew] **shalt escape.** Not by acquittal (Bengel [Hodge]), but by exemption. So Meyer: "Only the Gentiles shall be judged, according to the false opinion of the Jews (Bertholdt, *Christologie*, p. 206), but all Israel shall have part in the Messiah's kingdom as its true-born children (Matt. viii. 12)." [Comp. Matt. iii. 7, 9; John viii. 33.] The expression **escape** refers at the same time to an approaching actual judgment which will overtake every guilty person.

Ver. 4. **Or despisest thou.** This is a different case from the preceding. [ἤ introduces a new error or objection.—P. S.] In what does the difference consist? Thou regardest thyself either exempt from punishment, because thou believest thyself a favorite of the Deity, and that thou shalt escape at the coming judgment; or thou dost wickedly regard the riches of God's goodness in delaying the punishment as a sign that the general judgment will never come to pass at all. Paul frequently uses πλοῦτος as an expression for great fulness [chap. ix. 23; xi. 33; Eph. i. 7, 18; ii. 7; iii. 16; Col. i. 17. It is not a Hebraism, but found also in Plato and other Greek classics, to denote abundance and magnitude.—P. S.].—**His goodness.** The χρηστότης is, more specifically, mildness, beneficent goodness, in contrast with penal justice. It may be asked whether we should read: **His goodness** (χρηστότητος) **and forbearance** (ἀνοχῆς) **and long-suffering** (μακροθυμίας), or whether the χρηστότης is here divided by καί-καί, *as well, as also*, into the idea of *forbearance* and *long-suffering*. We accept the latter, since the Apostle subsequently groups all again in τὸ χρηστόν. The Apostle Peter uses the same expression, μακροθυμία, for the two ideas: forbearance toward the weakness of friends, and long-suffering toward the opposition of enemies [slowness in the infliction of deserved punishment]. But Paul distinguishes between *patience* or *forbearance*, chap. iii. 25, and *long-suffering*, chap. ix. 22, according to the relation already indicated. The ἀνοχή is about equal to the ὑπομονή, Col. i. 11, and the πραότης Col. iii. 12.—Compare ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων, Col. iii 13; μακροθυμεῖτε πρὸς πάντας. It is thus natural that one idea should sometimes run into the other. Tholuck: "The word of Christ (Luke xix. 41; Matt. xxiv.) would cause the expectation of a judgment on Israel, which really occurred about twenty [ten] years after this Epistle. Here Paul may naturally have had this in view."—Ἀγνοῶν The translation **Not knowing** is too weak. [Dr Lange translates ἀγνοῶν: *Indem du misskennst, wilfully ignoring;* while Grotius, Tholuck, Wordsworth, *al.*, render it: *not considering*.—P. S.] Meyer opposes the interpretation of ἀγνοεῖν as *wishing not to know* (De Wette [Alford], and others). Yet *wilful* and *culpable* ignorance is certainly meant here (comp. ἄγνοια, Eph. iv. 18).—**Is leading thee to repentance.** ἄγει means, at all events, not only the objective intention of God (Philippi), but also the real determination of Divine goodness. [Bengel: *Deus ducit volentem duci; ducit suaviter, non cogit necessitate.* Wordsworth: "The word ἄγει, *leads*, intimates the *will of God*, but also the *will of man*. God leads, but man *may refuse* to be led." To this Dr. Hodge assents, but adds, from his strict Calvinistic standpoint: "Who gives the will to be led? Is there no preventing grace [*gratia præveniens*]? Does not God work in us to *will*, as well as to *do*? Surely there is such a thing as being made willing without being forced. There is a middle ground between moral suasion and coërcion. God supersedes the necessity of forcing, by making us willing in the day of His power. The Apostle, however, is not here speaking of gracious influence, but of the moral tendencies of providential dispensations."—P. S.]

Ver. 5. **But, after thy hardness** [Κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου]. Evidently not a continuation of the question (Lachmann [Alford]), but antithesis. The hardened one mistakes the benign purpose of Divine government, and by this means transforms the same into a judgment. The question can therefore not be one of mere frustration. [Κατά is taken by some, *in proportion to*, so that the degree of punishment corresponds to the degree of hardness and impenitence; but by most commentators in the sense of *secundum*, *i. e.*, as may be expected from thy hardness, agreeably to its nature.—P. S.]—**And impenitent heart.** This takes away from the idea the harsh appearance of a fatalistic compulsion. The hardness is voluntarily continued and magnified by impenitence of heart.—**Thou treasurest up for thyself** [thou for thyself, not God for thee.—P. S.] The verb θησαυρίζειν is used in the wider sense of every accumulation, and denotes also ironically the heaping up of evils and punishments. It here stands in striking opposition to the πλοῦτος of God's goodness. The despising of the riches of God's goodness in forbearance and long-suffering is the heaping up of a treasure of wrath. **Unto thyself** indicates voluntary guilt as well as completed folly.—**In** [or *on*, ἐν] **the day of wrath.** The construction is not θησαυρίζεις εἰς ἡμέραν, &c. (Luther [E. V., *against*], Tholuck), and also not an ὀργή which will break out on the day of wrath (Meyer [Alford, Hodge]). But the

meaning is, that the day of wrath is even now ready to burst forth, and that that furious and senseless θησαυρίζειν still continues; comp. James v. 3; ἐθησαυρίσατε ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις. Every catastrophe of judgment which succeeds a period of long-suffering is designated a day of wrath (Ezek. xxii 24; Zephaniah ii. 2). But each of these judicial catastrophes is a prelude to the last day of consummated wrath.—**And revelation** [manifestation] **of the righteous judgment.** The δικαιοκρισία (in the New Testament, ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, and but seldom elsewhere).* The righteous judgment of God proceeds in an emphatic way through all periods of time; but it has special epochs of its ἀποκάλυψις. The whole contemplation of different judicial catastrophes consists in the certainty that the time of final decision is introduced with the coming of Christ. Tholuck cites Klopstock's lines:

> "Among the ways of men
> God walks, with quiet tread, His unseen path;
> But drawing near the goal, He rushes on,
> Decided as the gleaming thunderbolt."

SECOND PARAGRAPH (VERS. 6–11).

[It may aid the reader in the exegesis of this paragraph to have in view the following parallel arrangement in four stanzas of three lines each, which we adopt from the Analysis of Forbes, with some changes in the translation:

6. Who will render to every man according to his deeds;

7. A { To those who by endurance in good work
Seek for glory, and honor, and immortality,
Eternal life:

8. B { But to those who are self-seeking,
And disobey the truth, but obey unrighteousness,
Indignation [shall be] and wrath:

9. B { Tribulation and anguish
Upon every soul of man that worketh evil,
Of the Jew first, and also of the Greek;

10. A { But glory, honor, and peace,
To every man that worketh good,
To the Jew first, and also to the Greek.

The first two stanzas, A and B, and the last two stanzas, B and A, are antithetically parallel in each of their lines, which indicate: (1.) The character of the two opposite classes to be compared; (2.) their respective pursuits; and (3.) the appropriate rewards. In another point of view the four stanzas are introversively parallel, the first corresponding with the fourth, and the second with the third. The glorious reward of the righteous is put first and last in order to stimulate and encourage the reader. The lines in each stanza are also introversively parallel, as is made apparent to the reader by the typographical arrangement.—P. S.]

Ver. 6. **Who will render to every man.** The negative form of this declaration, see ver. 11. The righteousness of God is far above the partisan righteousness of man, and also above *that* partisan justice which believes that God's government is restrained by the historical difference between Judaism and heathendom. The decision stated by the Apostle is pronounced by the fundamental law of the entire Scriptures, of all Christendom, and of all religion (comp. Ps. lxii. 12; Isa. iii. 10, 11; Jer. xvii. 10; Matt. vii. 21–24; xii. 36; xvi. 27; xxv. 35; John v. 29; Rom. xiv. 10; 2 Cor. v. 10). The supposition that there is a great difficulty here, and an apparent contradiction between this sentence and the doctrine of justification by faith, is a remarkable indication of an inadequate view of works on one hand, and of justification by faith on the other. Tholuck gives an account of the question in discussion, p. 88 sqq. Solutions of the imaginary difficulty: 1. The Apostle speaks here only hypothetically of the judgment of believers, as God would judge them, apart from the standpoint of the gospel (Melanchthon, &c.). Tholuck: Here, and in ver. 16, the Apostle regards only the Divine valuation placed on men, apart from redemption. [So, substantially, Alford and Hodge.—P. S.]. 2. He speaks of the final judgment, when faith will be proved to be the absolute fulfilment of the law (Olshausen). This is adopted by Philippi, but under the restriction: That the δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως will remove the deficiency in the works of the regenerate. Gerhard: *Opera adducentur in judicio non ut salutis merita, sed ut fidei testimonia et effecta.* 3. Fritzsche: The Apostle is inconsistent, and here opens a *semita per honestatem* near the *via regia* of justification. 4. Luthardt: The new vital form of faith must be regarded as the product of a previous direction of life; the ἔργα are perfected in faith (*Studien und Kritiken* for 1852, No. 2, p. 368). [This view seems inconsistent with the Scripture doctrine of regeneration as a new creation, and of the new life as the reverse of the old (Rom. vi. 4, 19 ff.), and with the personal experience of Paul. But see Dr. Lange's remarks below, and consider the remarkable concession of Peter, Acts x. 34, 35, where a disposition to fear God and to work righteousness is supposed to exist before conversion, even among heathen, and to qualify them for acceptance with God.—P. S.] 5. Cocceius and Limborch: The faith in Christ must also be included as the highest work (ἔργον). This view is undoubtedly correct; and Tholuck's explanation, that πίστις εἰς χριστόν must *not* be included here (with reference to chap.

* [In the writings of Justin Martyr and other fathers. See Meyer *in loc.*—P. S.]

iv. 5; xi. 16; x. 6), obscures the whole question. The passages cited by Tholuck plainly relate altogether to a life in the works of the law. But in John vi. 29 Christ calls faith a work of God which believers should exercise. Paul also calls faith a good work (ἔργον ἀγαθόν), Phil. i. 6; viewing it, however, as the operation of God. In 1 Thess. i. 3, he speaks of an ἔργον τῆς πίστεως; also in 2 Thess. i. 11. He means in these passages, of course, such a faith as proves itself by works. But it follows, nevertheless, most decidedly, that he distinguishes just as positively two kinds of works, just as James distinguishes two kinds of faith. We must therefore distinguish a two-fold conception of works with the Apostle, if we would escape the confusion made by a timid species of orthodoxy. The direction of faith as well as of unbelief has, according to Paul—as Luthardt has properly remarked—its *antecedens* in the antithesis of the fundamental tendencies which he describes in vers. 7, 8. The one class are, in their inward frame of mind, ζητοῦντες, *striving souls*—therefore men of longing and aspiration, poor in spirit [Matt. v. 3]. Their good works constitute a unity of effort, ὑπομονὴ ἔργου; their aim is the δόξα, τιμή, ἀφθαρσία (goodly pearls; precious pearls, Matt. xiii. 45). The other class are, in their mental disposition, ἐξ ἐριθείας, *contentious*, even when they confess an orthodox form of faith. They are men animated by the bigotry of party spirit, and therefore wantonly rebelling against the truth, while they are the narrow-minded slaves of the unrighteousness of party spirit. But the retribution of both classes will be determined by the respective degrees of virtue and vice which they reach. As seekers, they find faith and justification by faith, which, according to chap. iii., proceeds also from righteousness. As believers, they strive for the treasure of their heavenly calling, and strive after those things which are before them, until they reach the goal of perfection. But there they do not appear with works of the law, nor with a mixture of perfect *justitia imputata* and imperfect works. In the kingdom of perfect love the antagonism of merit and grace disappears in a higher unity of both. It is observable that, with the Apostle, all the ideas of the Old Testament become more profound, and are made perfect: 1. The law becomes the law of the Spirit; 2. work becomes the work of faith; 3. righteousness becomes justifying righteousness; 4. retribution becomes free, rewarding love. The observation of Meyer, that we have here the law of the Jews only, and with it the natural law of the Gentiles as the medium affecting the decision, does not relieve the matter. He indeed also adds, that Paul had good reason for this statement, since the Christian, too—because he is to be judged according to his conduct—must be judged according to the law (comp. the doctrine of the *tertius usus legis*), and according to the πλήρωσις τοῦ νόμου introduced by Christ [Matt. v. 17; xxv. 31 ff.; Rom. xiii. 8–10]. He justly rejects the opinion of Reiche, that the doctrine of justification by faith implies a partial abrogation of the moral order of the world.*

Ver. 7. **To those who by endurance (or perseverance) in good work** [καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ, an adverbial qualification of the verb ζητοῦσι], &c. Where the different works are only one good work, and where there is this perfect *endurance* of life and effort, the direction toward higher and eternal things can only be meant. The genitive ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ is *genit. subj.* (not *obj.*; Meyer); that is, the endurance which is peculiar to the truly good work. [Comp. ὑπομονὴ τῆς ἐλπίδος, 1 Thess. i. 3.—P. S.]. It may be asked, whether the Apostle here uses the words δόξα, τιμή, and ἀφθαρσία, in the specifically Christian sense, or in the more general sense. If the former be the case, they mean future salvation in its *glory* (2 Cor. iv. 17; Matt. xiii. 43), in the *honor* connected with it (for it is the reward of victory, 1 Cor. ix. 25; joint heirship with Christ, chap. viii. 17; reigning together with Him, 2 Tim. ii. 12), and in its *incorruptibility* (1 Cor. xv. 52 sqq.; Rev. xxi. 4; 1 Peter i. 4). But then it must be said that the passage refers to a seeking whose object (goodly pearls, Matt. xiii.) is, at the beginning, more or less concealed from the seekers themselves (comp. Acts xvii. 23). It seems more natural, however, to interpret the above ideas as stages of the development of noble seeking; the first aim is δόξα, spiritual splendor of life, ideality; then τιμή, integrity, honorableness of character; then ἀφθαρσία, deliverance from corruption. The ζωὴ αἰώνιος, as the grace and gift of God, is very nearly related to this last object of ζητεῖν. The restless ζητεῖν—dissatisfaction, and further striving, until the object is reached, here or there—(Matt. v., the first beatitudes; Acts xvii.) remains the key-note. Other constructions: 1. Œcumenius, Luther: ἀποδώσει [to be supplied from ver. 6] is connected with the accusatives δόξαν, τιμήν, ἀφθ.; and ζητοῦσι with ζωὴν αἰώνιον [*i. e.*, "*Who will give* glory, honor, and immortality to those who, by patience in good works, seek eternal

* [Of the English and American commentators, whom I have consulted, Dr. Hodge is the only one who takes some pains to solve the dogmatic difficulty presented by this apparent contradiction of the doctrine of retribution according to works, and the doctrine of justification by faith. I quote the substance of his remarks: "First, notwithstanding the doctrine of gratuitous justification, and in perfect consistency with it, the Apostle still teaches that the retributions of eternity are according to our works. The good only are saved, and the wicked only are condemned. * * * The wicked will be punished on account of their works, and according to their works; the righteous will be rewarded, not on account of, but according to their works. Good works are to them the evidence of their belonging to that class to whom, for Christ's sake, eternal life is graciously awarded; and they are in some sense and to some extent, the measure of that reward. But it is more pertinent to remark, in the second place, that the Apostle is not here teaching the method of justification, but is laying down those general principles of justice, according to which, irrespective of the gospel, all men are to be judged. He is expounding the law, not the gospel. And as the law not only says that death is the wages of sin, but also that those who keep its precepts shall live by them, so the Apostle says, that God will punish the wicked and reward the righteous. This is perfectly consistent with what he afterwards teaches, that there are none righteous; that there are none who so obey the law as to be entitled to the life which it promises; and that for such the gospel provides a plan of justification without works, a plan for saving those whom the law condemns. He is here combating the false hopes of the Jews, who, though trusting to the law, were by the principles of the law exposed to condemnation. This he does to drive them from this false dependence, and to show them that neither Jew nor Gentile can be justified before the bar of that God, who, while He promises eternal life to the obedient, has revealed His purpose to punish the disobedient. All, therefore, that this passage teaches is, that irrespective of the gospel, to those who either never heard of it, or who having heard, reject it, the principle of judgment will be law." This is a combination of the interpretation of Tholuck with that of Olshausen, enumerated above as Nos. 1 and 2. Stuart: "There is some real goodness in the works of the sanctified; and this will be rewarded, imperfect as it is, not on the ground of law, but on the ground of grace." Very unsatisfactory. Dr. Wordsworth says not a word on this difficulty, but gives a long extract from Jerome's work against Pelagius in explanation of ver. 6.—P. S.]

life]; 2. Reiche [Ewald]: *τοῖς μὲν* [to the one] *καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν και τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν* (*ἀποδώσει*)—*ζητοῦσιν ζωὴν αἰώνιον* [*ζητοῦσιν* as apposition to *τοῖς μέν*]. 3. Bengel [Fritzsche] and others: *τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομ. ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ* (*οὖσιν*), *δόξαν*, &c. *ζητοῦσιν*—*ζωὴν αἰώνιον* (*ἀποδώσει*) [*i. e.*, to those who persevere in good work, seeking glory, &c., *He will give* eternal life]). Beza suggests still another and very dogmatic construction: *Qui secundum patientem exspectationem quærunt boni operis gloriam.* Our construction has most expositors in its favor [Vulgate, Calvin, Grotius, Tholuck, Olshausen, De Wette, Meyer, Philippi, Alford, Hodge, &c.]; also the clearness of the parallel, in consequence of which, righteous retribution constitutes the conclusion both times.—*Ὑπομονή*, not patience, but *perseverantia* (Erasmus). *Ἔργον*, not collectively (Tholuck [Hodge]), but dynamically. [The singular indicates the general course and habit of life, or the moral character as a unit, as distinct from isolated resolutions and actions, comp. Gal. vi. 4; 1 Thess. i. 3; James i. 4, &c. The E. V., *patient continuance in well-doing*, though not literal, is well expressed.—P. S.] *Δόξα, τιμή, ἀφθαρσία*, are the phases of the manifestation of the *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* for those who have from afar been striving for salvation. The matter is inverted in the case of believers: *Power of life, worth of life, glory of life.** Tholuck's remark is strange, that "the Apostle characterized here the striving of the better class of unbelievers in such a manner as he could hardly expect to find it by any possibility among them." But Paul had become acquainted with such men as Gamaliel, Sergius Paulus, Gallio, and others.

Ver. 8. **But to those who are self-seeking partisans.**† [Literally, *those of self-seeking*—a periphrase of the subject, indicating the origin (*ἐκ*, *out of*, as from a root) and moral character; comp. *οἱ ἐκ νόμου*, the legalists; *οἱ ἐκ πίστεως*, the believers; *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*, the circumcised, &c., and the cognate use of *υἱοί* and *τέκνα*.—P. S.]. On *ἐριθεία*, compare Tholuck and Meyer. We must not, with the elder commentators, derive it from *ἐρίζω* or *ἔρις* [from which it is distinguished, 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 20.—P. S.], and therefore not identify it with *φιλονεικία*, *contentiousness* (Vulgate: *Qui sunt ex contentione, die Streitsüchtigen*); but it comes from *ἔριθος*, *a hireling; ἐριθεύω*, *to work for wages, to act selfishly.* Its first meaning is *greediness*, then *trickery*, *partisanship.* Aristotle, *Polit.* v. 2, 3, &c.; see Fritzsche, *Excursus* on Rom. ii.‡ Meyer: "The latter signification [*Ränkesucht, Parteitreiberei*] must be retained in *all* passages of the New Testament; 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 20; Phil. i. 16; ii. 3; James iii. 14, 16." The succeeding words also establish this explanation. [The opposite of *οἱ ἐξ ἐριθείας* is *οἱ ἐξ ἀγάπης*, Phil. i. 16, 17. Ignatius, *Ad Philad.* 8, opposes *ἐριθεία* to *χριστομάθεια*.—P. S.] Tholuck: The Apostle has here in view those Jews who surpassed the Gentiles in opposition to the gospel. He recalls to mind the intrigues of the "Zealots," and supposes that the popular sense has extended to the meaning of *contention*, probably on the ground of the supposed derivation from *ἐρίζειν*. Remember the contentious spirit of the Talmudist Jews. In point of fact, the party spirit is always united with the love of contention. But the *ἐριθεία* is a corruption, which exists in Gentiles and Jews alike. There are only two kinds of men: Men who are of the truth, whose ethical principle of life is the truth (the upright; Prov. ii. 7; John iii 21), and who, being such, do not lose themselves in grasping after temporal objects; and men whose ethical principle of life is a contentious spirit, that is, the spirit of any bad temporal object, and who for this very reason seditiously oppose the truth as partisans, and are subject to unrighteousness, as slaves to party. In this direction every temporal form of divine things can be converted into a party affair, and destroyed by party spirit; just as the Jews of that period made even an *ἐριθεία* out of the Old Testament religion. Nevertheless, the definite idea is obliterated, if *ἐριθεία* is made to mean, without qualification, ungodliness, or vileness (Köllner, Fritzsche).—**Disobey the truth.** *Ἀπειθεῖν*; the truth has the right of a king, and Christ is King, as King of the truth. Therefore, to strive against the truth, involves not only religious opinion, but moral misconduct. Such revolters against what is high are necessarily slaves to what is low; they bow before unrighteousness (chap. i. 18).—**Wrath and indignation.** The nominative *ὀργὴ καὶ θυμός* is supplied by *ἀποδώσεται*, or *ἔσται*, as *constructio variata.** *Θυμός* as *excandescentia* enhances the idea of *ὀργή*. The historical form of the judgment pronounced on the self-seeking party spirit is therewith intimated; *ὀργή* and *θυμός* of the party spirit are judged by *ὀργή* and *θυμός* of an opposite kind; and therein the *ὀργή* and *θυμός* of the Lord are revealed. (See the history of the destruction of Jerusalem, Matt. xviii. 33, 34).—[The majority of philologists and commentators make *ὀργή* express the permanent feeling and settled disposition (comp. John iii. 36; the wrath of God *abideth* on him); *θυμός*, the momentary impulse or actual outbreak of wrath on the day of judgment. Ammon.: *θυμὸς πρόσκαιρος, ὀργὴ πολυχρόνιος.* *θυμός* (*Gemüth*) is the mind as the seat of the emotions, and hence denotes vehement affection, anger, fury. According to the correct reading, it fitly follows *after ὀργή*, as its execution and outbreak; *iræ excandescentia* (Cicero, *Tusc.*

* [Tholuck makes *δόξα* the condition, *τιμή* the recognition, *ἀφθαρσία* the unbroken continuance of the blessedness of the saints. Hodge: The manifested excellence or splendor of the future condition is expressed by *δόξα*, the honor due such excellence by *τιμή*, and the endless nature of blessedness by *ἀφθαρσία*. Similarly Meyer.—P. S.]

† [Lange renders *οἱ ἐξ ἐριθείας*, *die vom Parteitreiben her sind.*—P. S.]

‡ [Fritzsche renders the word *malitiosi fraudum machinatores.* This derivation was first suggested by Rückert and is now generally adopted; also by Alford, Wordsworth, and Hodge, although Hodge renders the word *contentious*, and gives it in the present case a wider meaning, like De Wette and Tholuck. Conybeare and Howson: "*Ἐριθεία* seems to mean selfish *party intrigue conducted in a mercenary spirit*, and more generally, *selfish cunning* . . . *ἐριθευομένους* is used for *intriguing partisans* by Aristotle (*Polit.* v. 3). The history of the word seems to bear a strong analogy to that of our term *job.*" Moses Stuart adheres to the old derivation from *ἔρις*; Robinson adopts the correct derivation from *ἔριθος*, *ἐριθεύω*, but gives it the same meaning as *ἔρις*, *party-strife*, *faction*, *contention*. P. S.]

* [The change of construction is a delicate adjustment in the Greek, to express the nice distinction that God is directly the Author and Giver of eternal life, but not strictly and primarily of eternal punishment, which is the necessary result of the sinner's own conduct. A similar distinction is intended by the change of construction from the active *προητοίμασεν* to the passive *κατηρτισμένα*, Rom. ix. 22, 23. The vessels of mercy God Himself *had before prepared* unto glory, but the vessels of wrath *are fitted*, or have fitted themselves, for perdition. Comp. *Textual Note* ⁴.—P. S.]

iv. 9). "ὀργή is the *heat* of the fire; θυμός is the bursting *forth* of the *flame*."—P. S.]

Ver 9. **Tribulation and anguish** (θλῖψις καὶ στενοχωρία). Vers. 9 and 10 repeat the same thought of retribution, but in greater precision and increased force: 1. The retribution of evil and good does not merely stand as the limit at the close, but it is ordained from the beginning, and follows man like a shadow; 2. it does not only overtake all in general, but will visit every individual; 3. it reaches to the soul; 4. it comes also as punitive retribution, first to the Jews, and then to the Gentiles. The same may be said also of the reward of the righteous. Punishment goes from without inwardly; the external **tribulation**, or oppression, becomes an internal **anguish**, or agony, from which the burdened soul knows no escape.*—**Every soul of man** [כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ אָדָם]. Ψυχή is not merely a circumlocution of ἄνθρωπος (according to Grotius, Fritzsche). [It expresses the idea that the soul, and not the body, is to suffer the penalty, according to Rückert, Meyer, Fritzsche. But ψυχή rather denotes the whole person, as in chap. xiii. 1.—P. S.]

That worketh out the evil. The κατεργαζομένου must be regarded as a strong form. It is the consistent consummation. [Alford: "κατεργάζομαι, *to commit*, is more naturally used of *evil*, while ἐργάζομαι, *to work*, is used indifferently of both good and evil." But κατεργάζεσθαι is also used of the good; v. 3; xv. 18; Phil. ii. 12. As distinct from the simple ἐργάζεσθαι, it signifies, to work *out*, to bring to an end, to consummate. Comp. Meyer on Rom. i. 27 (p. 77).—P. S.]

Ver. 10. **But glory and honor and peace.** Instead of ἀφθαρσία, we have here εἰρήνη ["here in its highest and most glorious sense"] as the subjective enjoyment of ἀφθαρσία, by which the expression ψυχή is supplied (ver. 9).—**Of the Jew first, and also of the Greek.** *Greek* represents the *Gentile*, as i. 16. As the Jew is first in privilege and opportunity, so he is first in responsibility and guilt. Comp. Luke xii. 47, 48, and *Exeg. Notes* on i. 16. It becomes now evident that the second chapter refers especially to the Jews, as chap. i. 18–32 to the Gentiles.—P. S.]

Ver. 11. **For there is no respect of persons.** This conclusion reproves especially the exclusive party spirit of the Jew—who thought himself under the particular favor of God—by reference to a parallel expression in the Old Testament, Deut. x. 17; see Gal. ii. 6. The expression, *to respect the person* (to accept the face),† is used in the Old Testament in a good as well as bad sense; but in the New Testament it occurs only in a bad sense, because it is here employed always in combating the conceit of Jewish bigotry, which changed God into a partisan.

THIRD PARAGRAPH (VERS. 12–16).

Ver. 12. **For as many as sinned without law.** Tholuck: The Apostle here mentions the judgment only on its condemnatory side, because according to his purpose in chap. iii. 20, it was no necessary that he should take a broader view here. But he also wishes to prepare for the doctrine of justification by faith. Thus, vers. 12 and 13 establish ver. 9; and, on the other hand, vers. 14, 15, and 16 establish ver. 10.—**Without law,** ἀνόμως; that is, without the knowledge and norm of the Mosaic law (comp. Rom. v. 13)—that is, without a definite consciousness of definite transgression (1 Cor ix. 21). [Νόμος and ἀνόμως throughout here refer to the written or revealed law of Moses, as the expressed will of God concerning our moral conduct. The heathen are called ἄνομοι, not absolutely —for they have the unwritten law of conscience— but as distinguished from the Jews, who were ὑπὸ νόμον. ἀνόμως therefore is equivalent to χωρὶς νόμου.—P. S.]—**Shall also perish without law** Meyer: "ἀπολοῦνται is the opposite of the σωτηρία in i. 16, of the ζήσεται in i. 17, of the ζωὴ αἰώνιος in ii. 7, of the δόξα, &c., in ii. 10. Comp John iii. 15; Rom. xiv. 15; 1 Cor. i. 18." Since the ἀπολοῦνται has its degrees (comp. Matt. xi. 22; Luke xii. 48), Meyer should not deny that (as Chrysostom, Theophylact, Œcumenius assert) there is something alleviating in the ἀνόμως. The external consequences of sin could be similar, yet the internal consequences could be different, according to the different degrees of the knowledge of transgression; and κριθήσονται is accordingly a stronger expression than ἀπολοῦνται. We should all the more reject the barbarous view of Dodwell, Weisse, Billroth, and others, by which the ἀπολοῦνται is made to express the *annihilation* of those who do not possess the Christian principle (see Tholuck, p. 99) It is evident that also the ἀνόμως must not be understood absolutely (see ver. 15). They only do not possess the law in the clearness and fulness of the Mosaic code. [The passage certainly teaches, 1. That the immoral heathen will not escape punishment, since they, too, are inexcusable, having the light of God's general revelation in nature (i. 20), and in their conscience (ii. 14, 15); 2. that they will be judged ἀνόμως—*i. e.*, not with the rigor of the written law, as the disobedient Jews and unfaithful Christians, but impartially, and hence more mildly, according to the common law of reason and of conscience. The unfaithful Jews will fare worse than the Gentiles, and the unfaithful Christians worse than the Jews. The severity of punishment corresponds to the measure of guilt, and the measure of guilt depends on the amount of opportunity. The Bible plainly teaches different degrees of punishment; comp. Luke xii. 47, 48; Matt. xi. 21–24; xii. 41, 42. In the interpretation of this passage, moreover, we should not overlook what Paul says immediately afterward of the better class of heathen, vers. 14, 15, and 26–29; comp. the Notes below.—P. S.]

And as many as sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law. They shall be condemned according to the law. Νόμος, even without the article, signifies here the Mosaic law. The ἐν νόμῳ—De Wette: *in* the law; Tholuck, Meyer: in the possession of the law. The sense of the word seems to require a stronger expression. See chap. vii. 8. [ἐν signifies the status, *under* the law.—P. S.] This sentence verifies ver. 9: first upon the soul of the Jew, in contrast with the presumed righteousness of the Jew. Peter institutes a similar law for the Christian Church (1 Pet. iv. 17).

Ver. 13. **For not the hearers of the law**

* [Meyer and Alford: "θλῖψις signifies more the outward weight of objective infliction, στενοχωρία the subjective feeling of the pressure." They are often associated, viii. 35; 2 Cor. iv. 8; vi. 4. The latter is the stronger term, and hence it always follows by way of climax.—P. S.]

† [נָשָׂא פָנִים, to lift up, or accept the face of some one, *i. e.*, to be favorable or partial to him from personal considerations. In the N. T. the terms προσωποληπτέω, προσωποληψία, προσωπολήπτης (in some Codd. written with an μ before ψ) always denote the unjust partiality, and are denied to God and forbidden to man.—P. S.]

Griesbach and Reiche parenthesize vers. 13–15; Koppe, ver. 13; Lachmann, Meyer, Baumgarten-Crusius, vers. 14, 15. All these parentheses disturb the connection. Ver. 13 proves the damnableness of those who sinned against the law (see ver. 17, and James i. 22), and accordingly constitutes the transition to what follows.—Not **the hearers.** "Because the Mosaic law was known to the majority only by being read to them; Gal. iv. 21; Matt. v. 21; James i. 22; John xii. 34." Josephus, *Antiq.*, 5. 1, &c., Meyer.—**But the doers of the law shall be justified.** Philippi: "δικαιωθήσονται corresponds to δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ of the first member of the sentence: They shall be just before the judgment-seat of God—pronounced just by God. Δικαιοῦν, like the Hebrew הִצְדִּיק, as this passage already proves, is *terminus forensis*: to *declare* just, not to *make* just; for the doers of the law *are* already just, and need not be *made* just by God. Δικαιοῦν, from δίκαιος, according to the analogy of τυφλοῦν (to make blind), and other verbs in όω derived from adjectives of the second declension, means properly, it is true, according to the etymology, = *to make just*. Yet, as the Septuagint and the New Testament usage shows, we must supply, *by declaration*." Then δικαιόω is, originally, *to make just*, on the part of the δίκη [right, righteousness, also the goddess of righteousness], and according to its tribunal; that is, to *acknowledge just*, which has throughout a forensic, but never an *abstractly* forensic sense; as δικαιόω means also, in the classic sense, *to think* or *esteem just*, according to the tribunal of personal opinion. Therefore the innocent man also, when once he stands at the tribunal, must *be declared just*; and the guilty one, who is declared just in the tribunal of grace, receives with this declaration the δικαίωμα of Christ in his faith, without which he could never be pronounced just according to Divine truth. See the *Bible-Work* on James ii. 21 [p. 66 of the German, p. 85 of the Amer. ed.]. Even the punishment, according to the classical use of the term, becomes a δικαιοῦν, because the punished one, by punishment, becomes again conformable to the δίκη. According to Meyer, the Apostle has here only set forth the fundamental law of God judging in righteousness. According to Philippi, the ποιηταὶ τοῦ νόμου are here only placed as the true rule, in opposition to the false rule of the Jews, that the ἀκροαταὶ τοῦ νόμου should be just before God, apart from the question whether there are such ποιηταί; but the whole argument of the Epistle to the Romans proves, that no man is by nature such a ποιητὴς τοῦ νόμου. This construction does not coincide with vers. 14 and 15. We should rather observe here the deeper idea of ποιεῖν [ἐργάζεσθαι τὸ ἀγαθόν] in ver. 10, and of νόμος in ver. 14; and, at the same time, with Tersteegen's view of God's different tribunals, we must acknowledge that the Apostle can also use here the δικαιοῦν in the wider sense. Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 4. The connection of this passage with the following verses cannot be destroyed by a dogmatizing exegesis.*

Ver. 14. **For when Gentiles** [ἔθνη, without the article, meaning some, not all]. The confirmation of ver. 10 is introduced by what the Apostle has already said. The expositors seem here to have thoroughly wandered from the proper path, and to be influenced by a common misunderstanding of ver. 16. 1. According to Bucer, Calvin, Tholuck [Hodge], and others, ver. 14 refers to the first half of ver. 12. While there the question is concerning those who shall perish without law, the objection here to be met is, that there is only condemnation where a νόμος is present; in consequence of this, Koppe regards ver. 13 as parenthetical. Yet not only is the ἀπολογουμένων against this view, but also the τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν. 2. Philippi: The Apostle refers to the first half of ver. 13. "Not the hearers of the law are just before God, for the Gentiles have also a law; the Gentiles are also ἀκροαταὶ τοῦ νόμου." But this was not the case in the opinion of the Apostle. 3. According to Meyer, he refers to the second half of ver. 13. "The Gentiles possess a certain substitute for the Mosaic law. Therefore they are also subject to the rule: οἱ ποιητ. νόμ. δικαιωθήσονται." But the fundamental rule is adduced only hypothetically by the Apostle, and not in the sense that the Gentiles actually are doers of the law. The deduction of vers. 14 and 15 will evidently establish the proposition of ver. 10, "But glory, honor," &c., and "*also to the Greek*," after vers. 12 and 13 have established the proposition of ver. 9. *The fundamental thought is, that also the Gentiles can obtain eternal life;* for it was not necessary that he should first prove this in reference to the Jews. This thought is mediated neither by the first half of ver. 13 alone, nor by the second alone, but by the whole rule: Not the hearers of the law *are* already just before God, but the doers of the law, in the sense of ver. 7. The ζητοῦντες, as poor in spirit, who are penitent, *shall be* justified in the new economy of salvation.—**For when.** ὅταν "supposes a case whose frequent occurrence is possible: in case when, whenever, as often as" (Meyer [who refers to Kühner, ii. p. 535 f., and Matthiæ, p. 1195]).—**Gentiles,** ἔθνη, without the article. The rule might refer, as hypothetically expressed, to *the whole body* of the Gentiles (according to De Wette, Reiche [Philippi, Alford, Hodge], and others); but as it is too evident from the first chapter that this case did not really occur, there is very properly no article; and the supposition that there is really "an election" of

* [On the meaning of the terms δικαιόω, δικαίωσις, δικαιοσύνη, the reader is referred to the *Exeg. Notes*, chap. i. 17, and iii. 21–31. Dr. Hodge holds to the strictly forensic view, and agrees here with Philippi. "*To be just before God*," he says, "and *to be justified*, are the same thing. They are both forensic expressions, and indicate the state rather than the character of those to whom they refer. Those are just in the sight of God, or are justified, who have done what the law requires, and are regarded and treated accordingly; that is, are declared to be free from condemnation, and entitled to the favor of God. In obvious allusion to the opinion, that being a Jew was enough to secure admission to heaven, the Apostle says, It is not the hearers but *the doers of the law* that are justified. He is not speaking of the method of justification available for sinners, as revealed in the gospel, but of the principles of justice which will be applied to all who look to the law for justification. If men rely on works, they must have works; they must be doers of the law; they must satisfy its demands, if they are to be justified by it. For God is just and impartial; He will, as a judge administering the law, judge every man, not according to his privileges, but according to his works and the knowledge of duty which he has possessed. On these principles, it is his very design to show that no flesh living can be justified." Similarly Melanchthon: "*Hæc descriptio est justitiæ legis, quæ nihil impedit alia dicta de justitia fidei.*" But the real difficulty consists in the apparent conflict of Paul's doctrine of justification by grace alone through faith, and his doctrine of judgment by works, as taught not only here from the standpoint of the law, but elsewhere from the standpoint of the gospel as well, 2 Cor. v. 10; Rom. xiv. 10; Gal. vi. 7; Eph. vi. 8; Col. iii. 24, 25; Matt. xii. 36; xxv. 31–46; John v. 29. Comp. the comments on ver. 6, p. 96 ff. —P. S.]

such Gentiles thereby gains greater probability. [Comp. Meyer *in loc.*, and Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i. p. 567, who likewise press the absence of the article, and justly reject the reference to iii. 29; ix. 30; 1 Cor. i. 23 (quoted by De Wette, Alford, and Hodge, in favor of the other view). On the other hand, ἔθνη is not identical with ἐθνικοί, but indicates a species or class of Gentiles.—P. S.]

Who have no law, τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα. The absence of the article means not only that they have not the Mosaic law, but that they have no revealed religious law whatever.—**Do perchance by nature.** *By nature* (φύσει) must not, with Bengel and Usteri, be referred to the preceding. For also the Jews do not have the law *by nature*. *Nature* is here the original nature, as it proves itself active, especially in the noble few—in the impulse or tendency toward the noble.—**The things of the law.** It is the material substance of the religious and moral law, apart from the formal definitions of the Mosaic code. The exposition of Beza and others is dogmatizing: *Quæ lex facit* (*lex jubet, convincit, damnat, punit; hoc ipsum facit et ethnicus*, &c.; Cappell). [Hodge: "There are two misinterpretations of the phrase τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιεῖν. The one is, that it means, to fulfil the law; the other, to do the office of the law—*i. e.*, to command and forbid. The former is unnecessary, and is in direct opposition to the express and repeated declaration of the Apostle, that none, whether Jew or Gentile, have ever fulfilled the law. To do the things of the law, is indeed to do what the law prescribes (comp. x. 5; Gal. iii. 12); but whether complete or partial obedience is intended, depends upon the context. The man who pays his debts, honors his parents, is kind to the poor, does the things of the law, for these are things which the law prescribes. And this is all the argument of the Apostle requires, or his known doctrine allows us to understand by the phrase, in the present instance. This being the case, there is no need of resorting to the second interpretation mentioned above, which was proposed by Beza, and adopted by Wetstein, Flatt, and others. Though ποιεῖν τὰ τοῦ νόμου might mean to do what the law does, prescribe what is good, and forbid what is evil, it certainly has not that sense elsewhere in Paul's writings—see x. 5; Gal. iii. 12—and is especially out of place here, in immediate connection with the phrase ποιηταὶ τοῦ νόμου, in the sense of the doers of the law."—P. S.]

These, not having (the) **law, are a law to themselves.** οὗτοι is emphatic with approbation. νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες, in distinction from μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα, indicates want. Meyer: Their own moral nature supplies in them the place of the revealed law (see the classical parallels in Meyer). Philippi distinguishes between τὸν νόμον ποιεῖν [ver. 13, or τὸν νόμον τελεῖν, ver. 27] and τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιεῖν. They perform what belongs to the law; they observe only *single* outward commands of the law, one man this, another that. "Therefore they do not observe the law in its spirituality or deep inner meaning."* An utter perversion of the proper relation. Without knowing the laws of Moses, they observe the essential part of the law, τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου. Ver. 26, τὸν νόμον τελοῦντες, that is, performing it according to its defined purpose, ver. 27.

* [Forbes, p. 148, fully adopts this distinction of Philippi, and thinks it essential to the proper understanding of the whole passage.—P. S.]

Ver. 15. **Who shew,** &c. Οἵτινες is no "explaining or proving," but *emphasizing, recommending* (see the antithesis in ver. 1). *What* and *how* do these prominent Gentiles show? They show or exhibit, **the work of the law**; that is, the work required by the law. Not the law itself (Wolf, Koppe, &c.); for the Ten Commandments are not formally written in their heart, but the essential meaning of their requirement. Meyer: "The conduct *corresponding* to the law." More properly expressed, the conduct *intended* by it. Luther: The contents of the law; likewise Seiler and Baur. According to Meyer and Tholuck, the singular stands collectively instead of ἔργα. "As ver. 7" (Tholuck). But ver. 7 rather means that the ἔργα are only good when they proceed from the unity of a ὑπομονὴ ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ. In the higher aspiration of the Gentile there was this analogy to Christian faith: that it consisted really in the unity and consistency of sentiment and life.

Written in their hearts. The adjective γραπτὸν (supply ὄν) is stronger than the participle γεγραμμένον. [It implies the idea of permanency.] Evidently a contrast to the Mosaic record of the law on the tables of stone. See 2 Cor. iii. 7; Jer. xxxi. 33. Therefore a higher order of Judaism, similar to the New Testament life, is exhibited in its essential features in these chosen Gentiles (see the history of the Centurion at Capernaum). [The Greek poet Sophocles speaks of "the unwritten and indelible laws of the gods" in the hearts of men; and the Platonic philosopher Plutarch speaks of "a law which is not outwardly written in books, but implanted in the heart of man."—P. S.]

Who shew, ἐνδείκνυνται. And how do they exhibit or prove this? (see chap. ix. 17, 22.) 1. By the doing of the law (Zwingli, Grotius, and the majority of recent commentators; De Wette, Meyer). 2. By the mark of their better *endeavors* in many ways (in a certain measure, Calvin; but better Cocceius, tom. v. p. 46. Yet both are biassed by the Augustinian view). 3. By the law of conscience. Tholuck (according to Theodoret and Erasmus): "Who, indeed, bear the impress of the judgment of the law in themselves, and in correspondence therewith their consequent conscience assumes in them the office of judge. For where we find the exercise of the judicial power in man, we must also presuppose the legislative power." But this view is inconsistent not only with σύν in συμμαρτυρούσης (for the extended treatment of this question, see Tholuck, p. 105, and Meyer [p. 98, ed. iv., *the note*]), but also with ἐνδείκνυνται. Here the language is concerning *proofs of conscientiousness becoming outwardly manifest.* Numbers 1 and 2 are to be united, since the *well-doing*, according to ver. 7, is only the perseverance in a noble *endeavor* (under the *gratia præveniens*), which attains its object only in Christianity.

Their conscience also bearing witness [συμμαρτυρούσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως]. It gives witness *with*, in connection with their better manner of action. Both bear witness to the belief that they are a law to themselves, in their natural spontaneity. De Wette: "συμμαρτυρεῖν is neither equal to μαρτυρεῖν (Grotius, Tholuck), nor *una testari*, with reference to the ποιεῖν τὰ τοῦ νόμ. (Meyer, Fritzsche, &c.). But the σύν, like *con* in *contestari*, refers in part to the relation of the witness to him for whom he testifies; and in part, as in συνείδησις itself, to the inner relation of the conscious

ness." * But as the συνείδησις is a consciousness in man which is both objective and subjective, and hence independent of his merely subjective consciousness, so is the συμμαρτυρεῖν an independent witness of the right, which, in the case before us, corresponds with the witness of man in his deed. It is the Gentile's cheering and often even joyous consciousness of his right direction; as, for example, of the Wise Men from the East under the guidance of their star.

And between one another their thoughts accusing or also excusing. [Dr. Lange translates: *Indem zwischen ihnen die Gedankenurtheile anklagende oder auch entschuldigende sind.* He refers, with Meyer, μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων to the heathen, not to the thoughts.—P. S.] Different expositions: 1. Their thoughts inwardly accuse each other (Luther, Calvin, Tholuck [Alford, Hodge]). There are different views on μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων: *at a future time*, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ of judgment (Koppe); *post rem actam* (Vater); *between* (two portions of time), *at the same time, meanwhile* (Köllner [E. V.]). But we must observe, on the contrary, that Paul does not speak of the *inner* facts of the consciousness, since these facts here fall under the conception of the historical ἔνδειξις. 2. The accusations and defences which were conducted between Gentiles and Gentiles (Storr, Meyer). Against this interpretation Tholuck raises the question: "How can τῶν λογισμῶν, without a more special indication, refer to any other subject than the one whose witness of conscience has just been mentioned?" But if the μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων refers to the intercourse between Gentiles, then the following must have the meaning: *since* the judgments of their thoughts are throughout accusing or excusing; that is, therefore, moral judgments, which refer to the origin of an immanent moral law. The *accusing* thoughts come first here, because the language refers first of all to the nobler Gentiles, whose opinions are related to the ordinary popular life as judicial ideals. But also in their *excusing* they often appeal from barbarian legal practices to the unwritten law (see Sophocles, *Antigone*). In short, the whole intercourse between the nobler heathen is a kind of moral dialectics, a continual moral process of thought. [Paul describes the moral process which takes place in the heart of man after a good or bad act; the conscience, συνείδησις, sits in judgment, and pronounces the sentence in God's name according to the law; the διαλογισμοί are the several moral reflections and reasonings which appear as witnesses testifying and pleading in this court of conscience, and are often conflicting, since the sinful inclinations and passions interfere and bribe the witnesses; the object of the κατηγορεῖν, or ἀπολογεῖσθαι, is the moral action which is brought before the tribunal of the conscience. The ἢ καὶ indicates that the conscience finds more to accuse than to excuse. This judicial process, which takes place here in every man's heart, is a forerunner of the great judgment at the end of the world.—P. S.]

Ver. 16. **In the day.** The commentators seem here to overlook the obvious, proper meaning, because they suppose that the ἡμέρα on which God will judge the secrets of men, must be referred to the day of final judgment. But, in the first place, the connection does not support this view, and hence an artificial connection has been variously constructed (*the Gentiles show that on the day*, &c.). Calvin explains ἐν ἡμέρᾳ as εἰς ἡμέραν, *unto* or *until* the day. [Others modify this by making ἐν to include εἰς, "until and on that day."—P. S.] Tholuck fills up the apparent chasm between vers. 15 and 16 by supposing that the Apostle probably had in mind a transition such as καὶ τοῦτο μάλιστα, *and this especially*, with the remark: "This view has now become the general one." * Others have helped themselves by parentheses. "So Stuart inclines to unite ver. 16 with ver. 11; Beza, Grotius, Reiche, &c., connect it with κριθήσονται, ver. 12; † Vatabl., Pareus, and Lachmann, with δικαιωθήσονται, ver. 13." Meyer also, with Lachmann, parenthesizes vers. 14 and 15, and not, with Beza, and others, vers. 13–15. [Alford refers ver. 16 to the affirmation concluding with ver. 10, and regards vers. 11–15 as a series of quasi-parenthetic clauses, οὐ γάρ—ὅσοι γάρ—οὐ γάρ—ὅταν γάρ, assigning the reasons for the great retribution on the last day. Ewald goes back even to ver. 5.—P. S.] Secondly, the declaration that "God shall judge according to *my* gospel," pronounces against the reference of ἡμέρᾳ to the day of final judgment. Meyer passes over this difficulty with the remark of Calvin: *Suum appellat ratione ministerii.* His quotation of 1 Tim. ii. 8 does not argue any thing for his interpretation. On the opinion that, according to a number of the Fathers, the gospel of Paul must be understood to be the gospel of Luke, compare the quotation in Meyer. But the Scriptures take cognizance not merely of *one* day of judgment. *The day on which God judges the secrets of men according to the gospel of Paul, is the day when the Apostle preaches the gospel to them.* On this day, in this time of decision, it becomes manifest that there are Gentiles who are a law to themselves; that there is another opposition than that of external Judaism and paganism; that there are Gentiles who must be counted for the circumcision, and Jews whose circumcision must be counted for uncircumcision (see vers. 26 and 27). It is a thought whose root is found already in the Old Testament, that the time of the appearance of Christ and of the preaching of the gospel is a time of judgment. See Joel iii. 6, 7, and in other places; Malachi iii. 2 ff. In John iii. 19, even the appearance of Christ is relatively called the judgment. John v. 25: "The hour is coming, and now is." The time of perfect faith is denoted a day (John xvi. 23, 26). Also, in Rom. xiii., ver. 12 connected with ver. 13, the language cannot relate exclusively to the day of final judgment. The same applies to ἡμέρα in 1 Cor. iii. 13. Comp. 2 Cor. vi. 2, ἡμέρα σωτηρίας. The Apostle mentions this day without the article, without a solemn addition. He marks the day as the day when God shall judge the *secrets* of men. He uses the same word κρυπτά as in ver. 29, ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος. He says *men*—not merely the *Gentiles*—because the gospel, according to chaps. ix.–xi., manifests God's judgment not only on the Gentiles, but also on the Jews; and this is a judgment pronounced on their internal good conduct or misconduct toward the internal nature and spirit of

* [Similarly Alford: "Confirming by its testimony, the συν signifying the agreement of the witness with the deed, as *con* in *contestari, confirmare*; perhaps also the συν may be partly induced by the συν in συνειδήσεως—referring to the reflective process, in which a man confers, so to speak, with himself."—P. S.]

* [Wordsworth also adopts this connection with ver. 15, and quotes from Bishop Pearson (Art. VII. on the *Creed*): "Conscience is a witness bound over to give testimony for or against us at some judgment after this life to pass upon us."—P. S.]

† [So do the editions of Griesbach and Knapp and the E. V., who parenthesize vers. 13, 14, 15.—P. S.

the law. In this relation the gospel of the Apostle was the real medium and measure of the judgment (see 1 Cor. i. 18); and Jesus Christ was the real judicial authority. See John iii. 16; Acts xvii. 30, 31; 1 Cor. iv. 5, and other places.—On the day of the promulgation of the gospel the better Gentiles manifested their ordination to salvation, just as the majority of the Jews made manifest their hardness of heart.

[**According to my gospel.** The μου is to be either understood, *ratione ministerii* (Calvin, Meyer), or better, the gospel of *free grace* for the *uncircumcision*, which was especially committed to Paul, as the gospel for the circumcision was to Peter, Gal. ii. 7. The same expression occurs Rom. xvi. 25, 26.—**Through Jesus Christ,** as the appointed Judge of the world; Acts xvii. 30, 31; 1 Cor. iv. 5; 2 Cor. v. 10; Matt. xxv. 31; John v. 27, &c. While κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου favors Dr. Lange's interpretation of ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, the διὰ Ἰησ. Χρ. seems to refer rather to the *future* judgment; yet Christ has His hand in all the preparatory judgments of the history of the Church.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The common characteristic in the condemnable condition of the Gentiles and Jews is their religious and moral self-contradiction. In this self-contradiction Paul (chap. i. 21) discovers the beginning of the offence of the Gentiles, whom he represents as inexcusable (ἀναπολογήτους). The same self-contradiction is consummated, on one side, in the man who approves sin against better knowledge and conscience (chap. i. 32,), and, on the other side, in the man who condemns the sinner, and yet is guilty of weighty offences himself (chap. ii. 1). Therefore the expression inexcusable (ἀναπολόγητος) is also repeated here. The judgment of God is ever also a self-judgment of man. See Matt. xii. 37; xviii. 28; xxv. 26, 27. In the one who judges, the self-contradiction is completed as falsehood of the inner life in the very strongest degree. The sincere man, on the other hand (we can by no means speak of sincerity as absolute, but yet as gradually predominating), by looking into his own heart and life, arrives at that μακροθυμία, in relation to human sin and misery, which is akin to compassion, and points not to the judgment of condemnation, but to the saving judgment of the gospel.

2. The condemnatory judgment pronounced by the sinner on the sinner does not only condemn him in form, but transposes him also actually to a condition similar to condemnation. Fanaticism is never more unhappy than when it would compel, by measures of deceit and violence, those who think differently to adopt its pretended forms of happiness (James ii. 13).

3. The one who judges, says Paul (vers. 3, 4), has always a false idea of God. He either regards himself as the favorite of a partial God, on account of His conformity to theocratical, ecclesiastical, or legal forms, or he is inwardly vicious and wicked, and despises the real manifestations of God (see Ps. . 16–21). An atheistic element is common to both classes.

4. The long-suffering of God, or the forbearance of God's justice toward the sinner, stands in reciprocal action with the wrath of God. Both denote the polar antagonism in the government of absolute justice, which is no rule of abstract law, but has a living, pedagogic form corresponding to the relation of the Divine personality to the human personality See my *Positive Dogmatics*, p. 119. God's forbearance and clemency, no less than His wrathful judgment, looks to the working of repentance.

5. The unbeliever and hardened one, by his own deeds, transforms the works of God's forbearance and goodness into the preliminary conditions of His wrathful judgment, and accumulates for himself, out of the riches of God which he has experienced, a store of destruction.

6. The day of the rejected gospel is to man a day of inward judgment, as is proved by the destruction of Jerusalem. See the *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 5. But all judgments are prophecies and preludes of the last day of wrath. It is a narrow view, to suppose that the conception of historical periods excludes epochs, or that single epochs exclude the final catastrophe. This may also be applied to the idea of judgments. Just because the world's history is the world's judgment, the former pursues its course toward the latter.

7. The embarrassments of commentators on the sense of vers. 6–10 give evidence of timid and narrow views on the *doctrine of justification*. The passage gains its true light from the biblical doctrine that there is a *gratia praveniens* over the Gentile world, which even Augustine did not yet wholly ignore, but which, through his influence, was lost sight of in the orthodox theology of the Middle Ages, and, indeed, of more recent times. The seekers who are portrayed in vers. 7 and 10 will never think seriously of relying upon their works before God, because they are in a gravitation toward the Eternal, which will find rest only when they see God in Christ, either in this or the other world. But the opposite class—whose principle of life is party spirit, and reliance upon temporal association—will ever place their confidence in their own achievements, even when they vigorously reject the doctrine of the meritoriousness of good works. For, besides the righteousness of works (*Werkgerechtigkeit*), there is also a righteousness of doctrine, of orthodoxy (*Lehrgerechtigkeit*), a righteousness of the letter (*Buchstabenge echtigkeit*), a righteousness of negation and protest (*Negationsgerechtigkeit*), which have, in common with the righteousness of works, the fundamental characteristic of party righteousness (*Parteigerechtigkeit*), and may be the more dangerous forms as they are the more subtle. On the salvation of the heathen, comp. Tholuck, *Comm.*, pp. 92 ff.—The doctrine of justification cannot conflict with the doctrine of God's righteousness, by virtue of which He will reward every man according to his works.

8. Glory and honor and immortality—precious pearls; eternal life—the goodly pearl. See Matt. xiii. 45, 46.

9. It is the character of all party spirit to be a rebel upwardly against the royal right of truth, and, on the other hand, a slave downwardly to the tyrannical and terrifying spirit of party.

10. Because God, as the Righteous One, looks at the substance of personal life, He does not regard the person according to its external and civil conception, nor according to its external appearance and estimate.

11. In ver. 12, different degrees of punishment are evidently indicated. See the *Exeg. Notes*.

12. On δικαιοῦν, comp. the *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 13 [also i. 17, and iii. 21–31] Likewise the

Bible-Work on James ii. 20 ff. Since *δικαιοῦν*, even according to the idea of *making just*, can only mean to *declare just*, because the question is always concerning justification in some legal tribunal, the supposed exceptions where *δικαιοῦν* in the Scriptures is made to signify *to make just*, should be investigated anew. The passage, Isa. liii. 2, can really not otherwise be explained, than that He will, by virtue of his knowledge as the righteous servant of God, declare many just; and this because He shall bear their iniquities. The passage in Daniel, chap. xii. 3, must by all means be explained thus: That the subject is the judgment of the world, in which, according to the biblical representation, the righteous shall take part (1 Cor. vi. 2); and even if מַצְדִּיקֵי refers to this life, it no more means one who makes just, than מַשְׂכִּילִים means one who makes wise. The reading, *δικαιωθήτω*, Rev. xxii. 11, cannot be sustained against the more strongly credited rendering, *δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω*. See more on this subject *ad* chap. iii. 26.

13. On the occurrence of a *fulfilment of the law among the Gentiles*, see Tholuck, pp. 101, 102. The author, following the older theologians, very justly opposes Flacianism [*i. e.*, that sin is a substance, a revival of the old Manichæan heresy, by Flacius Illyricus, the editor of the Magdeburg Centuries, and a Lutheran controversialist of the 16th century. —P. S.]. To speak of virtues of the heathen, is liable to misunderstanding, unless we mean thereby a search after the Infinite. As heathen virtues, they can only be virtues of progress toward poverty in spirit (Matt. v. 3), under the guidance of the *gratia præveniens*, or fundamental forms of the development of a desire after salvation. The attempt, in Rothe's *Ethik*, part ii. p. 398 [1st ed.], to explain this class of virtues, is not very clear.

14. The three *objective* forms of seeking *higher attainments* in the *Gentile* world are: The *state*, as the expression of the search after righteousness in the conscience, or in the will; *philosophy*, as the expression of the search for an intelligent comprehension of the truth; and *art*, as the expression of the search for ideal contemplation, and the representation of life by means of the sentiments.

15. The three *subjective* forms of search for *higher attainments* in the *Gentile* world are: 1. *Works of magnanimity*. 2. The *conscience*, especially the cheerful impulses of the moral consciousness. "When they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy." 3. An *intercourse of moral judgments*, of either an excusing or accusing character. [Bishop Sanderson, as quoted by Wordsworth: Paul teaches here (ver. 15) that *every man*, however unholy, has a conscience, though depraved; and that, at the fall of man, conscience itself was not lost, but its rectitude and integrity were impaired; and that, when we are born again in baptism, we do not receive the infusion of *another* conscience, but our conscience, which was before unclean, is washed by the blood of Christ, and is cleansed by faith, and is enlightened by the Holy Spirit, in order that it may please God.—P. S.]

16. On the day of the crisis which the gospel brings to pass, it will appear that many Gentiles are really Jews, and that many Jews are really Gentiles. Likewise, many Christians of the Middle Ages were essentially believers of evangelical truth, while many so-called evangelical persons whose righteousness consists of works, and others whose righteousness consists of doctrines, and still others whose righteousness consists of their Protestantism, are, after all, only Roman Catholics at heart. Ideal dynamical antitheses, which the day of the Lord will bring to light, predominate over the historical antitheses, which possess very great significance. On the day mentioned here, see the *Exeg. Notes*.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

God's impartial righteousness is shown: 1. He does not give preference to the Jews, although they possess the law; 2. He is not prejudiced against the Gentiles, although they are without the law; but, 3. of one, just as of the other, He asks whether they have done good or evil (vers. 1–16).—Because others are black, we do not become white (ver. 1).—Judging our neighbor is the worst depravity, because: 1. We are blind toward ourselves; 2. we are unjust toward our fellow-men (ver. 1).—By our judgment of others we fall under the judgment of God pronounced on ourselves (ver. 3).—What does the celebration of a day of fasting and prayer require us to do? 1. Not to despise the riches of God's goodness, patience, and forbearance; but rather, 2. to remember that His goodness should lead us to repentance (ver. 4).—God's goodness regarded as the pure source of repentance (ver. 4).—Treasure not up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath (ver. 5).—*Dies iræ, dies illa, solvet sæcla in favilla* (vers. 5, 6).—What will God give to every man according to his works? 1. To some, glory and honor and immortality, together with precious peace; 2. to others, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish (vers. 6–11).—What it is *to continue patiently in well-doing* for *eternal life* (ver. 7).—God's indignation! 1. Not unmerited, but deserved; 2. not temporary, but eternal (ver. 8).—God's wrath: holy displeasure, not unholy anger.—No one is without law. For, 1. God has given His law to the Jews by Moses; 2. he has written the substance of it upon the hearts of the Gentiles (vers. 12–16).—The universal revelation of God in the conscience (vers. 14, 15).—The conscience, and human thoughts in their relation to each other. This relation is such, that, 1. The witness of the former testifies of the work of the law; 2. the latter, in the presence of such witness, accuse or excuse one another (vers. 14, 15)—Impossibility of preaching the gospel among the heathen, if they were deprived of conscience.—The revelation of God in the conscience, on the one hand, not to be despised; and, on the other, not to be overvalued.—Conscience regarded as the connecting link for every missionary sermon among the heathen.

LUTHER: * The little word "law" must not be understood here after a human fashion, that it teaches which works are to be done, and which are to be left undone; as is the case with the laws of men, which can be obeyed by works, without the feeling of the heart. God judges according to the intent of the heart, and will not be satisfied by words; but all the more punishes as hypocrisy and lying those works which are done without the feeling of the heart. Therefore Paul says that nobody is a doer of the law by the works of the law (ver. 15).

* Long-suffering is a virtue which is slow to become wrathful and to punish wrong. Patience is that which bears misfortune in property, body, or reputation, whether it happen justly or unjustly. Goodness is temporal reciprocal beneficence, and a friendly nature (ver. 4).

Starke: The ungodly are as the swine, which do not look at *the tree* whose acorns they gather up. Thus, with all their enjoyment of temporal mercies, they do not look up to God, who gives them richly to enjoy every good thing (Hosea ii. 7; Isa. i. 3; Jer. v. 24); for by every morsel of bread He seeks their improvement (ver. 4).—He who does not grow better, will grow worse by Divine goodness (ver. 5).—As the labor, so the reward; and each one must reap what he has sown (ver. 6).—The pious will gain in perfection in the kingdom of glory that which they had sought in the kingdom of grace (ver. 10).—Hedinger: To censure others, is the same as to condemn one's self. He who therefore loves to judge, pronounces sentence upon himself (ver. 1).—Blindness! Delay produces deception. Security follows Divine forbearance. Take care! The longer the storm gathers, the greater its devastation. The one who has received the long loan, has not therefore received it as a gift (ver. 4).—Every sin will receive its due reward. Who will trifle with it? (ver. 8.)—A greater measure of knowledge brings only greater condemnation, and no excuse. This much a Gentile knows of the will of God, that he may be condemned to death justly; much more may the Christian be justly condemned who can and should know perfectly the will of God in the law (ver. 14).—*Nova Bibl. Tub.:* The sinner can persuade himself, and by many kinds of misconception stupefy himself, so as to believe that his sins will go unpunished. Ah, how common is this deception! (ver. 3.)—Eternal life is a *jewel* for which we should strive, a *crown* for which we should fight, a *gift* which we should accept, hold, and keep until the end. He who perseveres, will be saved. The question at the judgment-day will not be one of words, but of deeds (ver. 7).—No one is without law! If it is not written in stone, it is nevertheless engraved upon the heart. Every one knows by nature what is just and what is unjust, what is good and what is evil (ver. 4).—Cramer: God must be truly in earnest for human salvation, which He seeks by prosperity and adversity. When words cannot avail, He punishes, and waits with great forbearance and patience until the sinner is converted (ver. 4).—The law of nature is a source of the written law of God, embraced in the two rules: Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; and what you would not have them do unto you, do not unto them (ver. 14).—No one can sin so that his sins shall remain concealed; for, if they are not revealed before, they will be brought to light at the last day (ver. 16).—*Würtemb. Bibl.:* Works are witnesses of faith. We must therefore do good works, not in order to be saved, but in order that with them we may testify of our faith, and by faith may inherit eternal life (ver. 7).—Lange: Abandon all the excuses of age, or condition, or other personal circumstances, that you, with your want of honest Christianity, bring forward; for you can derive no advantage from them before God's judgment-seat (ver. 11).—The law of nature must be of great advantage, and be written very deeply on the hearts of all men, since its wilful transgression brings upon men so great guilt, and punishment or condemnation (ver. 12).

Bengel: As long as man does not feel the judgment of God, he is apt to despise His goodness, Matt. xxviii. 18. Mark here the antithesis of the richness of Divine goodness despised, and the accumulated treasure of wrath.

O. v Gerlach: The *goodness* of God is manifested in the exhibition of blessings; His *patience*, in bearing with the sinner; and His *long-suffering* in withholding from punishment (ver. 4).—Christianity is not something lately discovered among men; but its Founder, the Son of God Himself, is the King and Judge not only of Christians, but likewise of Jews and Gentiles, whom He, in His preparatory households of grace—the former in His Father's house, the latter by an awakened longing for the same—is seeking to train up for His kingdom, though now they are far distant from home (ver. 16).—Lisco: Merely external honesty is also punishable (ver. 1).—*Glory*, splendor, instead of lowness, *honor* instead of contempt, and *immortality* instead of the mortal condition (1 Cor. xv. 53, 54), are the reward of patience, of the continuous striving for eterna life in spite of all impediments and difficulties (ver. 7).

Heubner: God's judgment is righteous: 1. Objectively: in accordance with sacred laws; not arbitrarily or capriciously, without regard to the person · 2. subjectively: according to the true character of the man, taking each one for his internal and external worth (ver. 2).—The dealing of God toward sinful men is simply this: He first tries each with goodness, before He pronounces punishment; it is our salvation to acknowledge this goodness, but it is our ruin to despise it (ver. 4).—The hardened heart is accusable: its operation is not that of nature, but of its own degeneration. How is it first *hardened?* 1. By frivolity; 2. by obstinacy and pride; 3. by actual, continued sinning (ver. 5).—The righteous impartiality of God. God does not judge: 1. By outward advantages, form, birth, pedigree, power, respect, wealth; nor, 2. by gifts of mind, acquisitions, skill; nor, 3. by external performances as such, by merely external works, external piety;—but by the whole inward sense, by the simplicity and clearness of the heart; by faith and fidelity. He has regard to what is given to each man (ver. 11).

The Pericope (vers. 1-11) for 10th Sunday after Trinity (Memorial of the destruction of Jerusalem), instead of 1 Cor. xii. 1-11: The impenitent sinner has no excuse before God.: 1. Proof; 2. application.—Man before the Divine judgment: He must, 1. Acknowledge himself guilty; 2. regard God's judgment righteous and inevitable; 3. take refuge in God's goodness, and listen to its call to repentance; 4. fear the future; 5. listen to revelation.—We should see ourselves reflected in the example of the impenitent Jews.

Daniel Superville: The sovereign equity of God (ver. 11).—Menken: The universal equality of men before God's judgment.

Spener: The whole law was written on the heart of the first man, for his soul was an image of God's perfect holiness and righteousness. But after this complete law had been erased from the heart, there remained, so to speak, only some of the larger letters, some portion of the knowledge of the manifest evil and good (ver. 15).—Conscience is nothing else than a voice of God (ver. 15).—Roos: Conscience is the consciousness or the judicial declarations of the law (ver. 15).

Besser: From man's knowledge of God's law written on his heart, there arises conscience, which *testifies* to him, as Luther excellently describes, the power with which conscience presses its judicial witness upon man (ver. 15).—To the question, "What disease is killing you?" the poet Euripides makes a

matricide answer: "Conscience; for I am conscious that I have done evil" (ver. 15).

J. P. LANGE: The judgment of men in the judgment of God.—The sources of judgment (vers. 4, 5). —How the sinner changes the treasures of God's goodness into treasures of wrath.—The great judgment-days in the world's history, especially the destruction of Jerusalem.—Justification and God's righteousness: 1. Apparent contradiction; 2. perfect unity.—Two kinds of men perceptible: 1. In two purposes; 2. two kinds of seeking; 3. two results (vers. 7-10).—God does not regard the person because He looks at it: 1. He does not regard it in a worldly sense; 2. He regards it according to its spiritual significance.—The gospel reveals the thoughts of the heart: 1. As a savor of death unto death; and 2. as a savor of life unto life.—But this does not apply to every form of Christianity.

[BURKITT: On the day of judgment as the time when God's character and dealings shall be displayed, ver. 5.—It will be a day when His righteousness shall be universally manifested and magnified; when all His attributes shall be glorified; His wonderful clemency sweetly displayed; His exact justice terribly demonstrated; His perfect wisdom clearly unfolded; all the knotty plans of Providence wisely resolved; all the mysterious depths of His counsels fully discovered; and His injured honor and glory clearly repaired, to the joyful satisfaction of all good men, and to the dreadful consternation and confusion of the wicked and impenitent world.—On ver. 16: Here, 1. A doctrine is boldly asserted—a coming day of judgment; and 2. its proof and confirmation —"according to my gospel."

[M. HENRY (condensed) on the whole passage, vers. 1-16: The Apostle, 1. Arraigns the Jews for their censoriousness and self-conceit; 2. asserts the invariable justice of the Divine government; 3. draws up a charge against the Jews; 4. describes the measures by which God proceeds in His judgment; and 5. proves the equity of all His dealings with men when He comes to judge them.

[MACKNIGHT: Paul distinguishes between *meritorious* and *gratuitous* justification; the former being that which is unattainable by works of the law, the latter that which is attainable, as James says, not by faith only, but by works also.—Ver. 15: That there is a natural revelation made to the heathen, is proved by Paul by three arguments: 1. By many virtuous acts performed by the heathen; 2. by the natural operation of their consciences; 3. by their reasonings with one another, by which they excused or accused one another.

[JORTIN: These suppositions agree both with Scripture and reason: 1. All men can do all that God requires of them; 2. all who do the best they can, derive help from God as far as is needful; 3. they all have Christ as their Redeemer, though He was never revealed to them.—Who knows whether the lot of the savage be not better than that of the philosopher, and the lot of the slave than that of the king? But this much we know, that every one ought to be contented with that state in which his wise and good Creator has placed him, and to conclude that it will be the best for him if he makes the best use of it. Upon this supposition the Divine impartiality stands fully justified.

[TIMOTHY DWIGHT: 1. Our eternal life is in itself an immense good; 2. eternal happiness consists in eternal disinterestedness and its consequences. (See sermon on *Consistency of Benevolence with seeking Salvation*, in which Lord Shaftesbury's celebrated theory, that disinterestedness is virtue, and the only virtue, is controverted.)

[JOHN FOSTER: To the present hour in each life the series of the Divine goodness may be counted by the succession of a man's sins. Not one sin, small or great, but immediately close by it were acts and proofs of this goodness. If this had been realized to thought, what a striking and awful admonition! Every sin a testimony, a representative of good; and the wonder is that the goodness goes on!

[*Annot. Parag. Bible* (London): The question is not (vers. 14, 15) whether any of the Gentiles have actually attained to eternal life without a Divine revelation, but whether they had the law of nature or conscience. They had this; and by it they shall be judged.—TAYLOR: Note Paul's wisdom in appealing to Jew and Gentile: 1. If the Jew could be convinced that a right-minded Gentile might be blessed with eternal salvation, why should he not now be pardoned, and taken into the visible Church? 2. the Gentile, made despondent by the representations of his guilt in the last chapter, here finds himself placed with the Jews, and entitled to hope in God's mercy.

[HODGE: The principles on which the Apostle assures us all men are to be judged, are, 1. He who condemns in others what he does himself, *ipso facto* condemns himself; 2. God's judgments are according to the real character of men; 3. the goodness of God, being designed to lead us to repentance, is no proof that He will not punish sin; 4. God will judge strictly according to works, not profession; 5. men shall be judged strictly according to their knowledge of duty.—*Further Remarks* by HODGE (condensed): 1. The deceitfulness of the heart strikingly exhibited in the different judgments they pass on themselves and others; 2. ask yourself, "How does the goodness of God affect me?" 3. genuine repentance produced by discoveries of God's mercy, legal repentance by fear of His justice; 4. any doctrine that tends to produce security in sin, must be false; 5. how vain the hopes of blessedness founded on God's partiality, or forgetfulness of sin; 6. to escape our guilt, we must seek the Saviour's righteousness; 7. He who died for the sins of men, will sit in judgment on sinners.

[Ver. 16. BARNES: On the propriety of a day of judgment, when all the thoughts of the heart will be revealed: 1. It is only by revealing these that the *character* is really determined, and impartial judgment administered; 2. they are not judged or rewarded in this life; 3. men of pure motives and pure hearts are often basely calumniated, and overwhelmed with ignominy; while men of base motives are often exalted in public opinion. It is proper that the secret principles of each should be revealed.—J. F. H.]

[Ver. 7. *By patient continuance in well-doing.* BARROW: No virtue is acquired in an instant, but by degrees, step by step; from the seeds of right instruction and good resolution it springs up, and goes forward by a *continual* progress and customary practice. 'Tis a child of patience, a fruit of perseverance, and, consequently, a work of time; for enduring implies a good space of time.—Ver. 9. ADAM: Every sin, when newly committed, amazes and terrifies the soul, though the sense of it soon wears off. How shall we bear the anguish of all our sins together, when conscience, which forgets and extenuates none, brings them to our remem-

brance?—Ver. 14. *A law unto themselves.* Bishop Pearson: Every particular person has a particular remembrance in himself, as a sufficient testimony of his Creator, Lord, and Judge. That man which most peremptorily denieth God's existence, is the greatest argument to himself that there is a God. Let Caligula profess himself an atheist, and, with that profession, hide his head or run under his bed, and when the thunder strikes his ears, and lightning flashes in his eyes, those terrible works of nature put him in mind of the power, and his own guilt, of the justice of God; whom, while in his wilful opinion he weakly denies, in his involuntary action he strongly asserteth. So that a Deity will either be granted or extorted, and, where it is not acknowledged, it will be manifested.—Vers. 5 and 16 Bishop J. Taylor: There are two great days in which the fate of all the world is transacted. This life is man's day, in which man does what he pleases, and God holds His peace. But then God shall have His day too, in which He shall speak, and no man shall answer. If we do the work of God in our own day, we shall receive an infinite mercy in the day of the Lord.—Ver. 16. *My gospel.* The gospel: 1. A voice of love (*vox amoris*); 2. a voice of challenge (*vox contestationis*); 3. a voice of certainty (*vox certitudinis*); 4. a voice of persuasion and invitation (*vox invitationis*); 5. a voice of decision and judgment (*vox judicii*).—P. S.]

Fourth Section.—*The aggravated corruption of the Jew in his false zeal for the law (a side-piece to the corruption of the Gentile in his idolatrous worship of symbols). The fanatical and wicked method of the Jews in administering the law with legal pride, and in corrupting it by false application and treachery—an occasion for the blasphemy of God's name among the Gentiles.*

Chap. II. 17–24.

17 Behold,[1] [But if] thou art called [named, denominated, ἐπονομάζῃ] a Jew,
and restest in [upon] the law,[2] and makest thy boast of God [boastest in God],
18 And knowest *his* will, and approvest the things that are more excellent [provest,
19 or, discernest the things that differ],[3] being instructed out of the law; And art
confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which
20 [those who] are in darkness, An instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes,
which hast [having] the form [the representation, model, pattern, τὴν μόρφωσιν]
21 of knowledge and of the truth in the law. [,—] Thou therefore which [Thou,
then, who] teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a
22 man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not
commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost
23 thou commit sacrilege [literally, robbery of temples]?[4] Thou that makest thy boast
of [in] the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God? [through
24 the transgression of the law thou dishonourest God.][5] "For the name
of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you," as it is written
[Isa. lii. 5; Ezek. xxxvi. 20].

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 17.—[Instead of the *text. rec.*, ἰδέ, *behold*, which is not sufficiently sustained, read εἰ δέ, *but if*, with א. A. B. D*. K., Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Bloomfield, Alford, and nearly all the recent commentators. The reading ἰδέ is either a mistake, or a change for the purpose of avoiding the anacoluthon, which, however, is more apparent than real. The apodosis must be supplied (*why dost thou not act accordingly*, or, *how great is thy responsibility*), or it may be found in ver. 21, by simply omitting the οὖν, which is often epanaleptic, resuming the thread of the sentence. So Meyer, who regards vers. 17–28 as the protasis, and 21, 22 as the apodosis.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 17.—[ἐπαναπαύῃ νόμῳ, without the article, א. A. B. D[1]. The later MSS. and the *text. rec.* insert τῷ before νόμῳ, because it here clearly applies to the written law of Moses as representing the whole Mosaic system, the civil and religious polity of the Jews. νόμος has here as in ver. 14 the force of a proper name. Alford: "The article is omitted, because 'the law' is not here *distributed*—it is not *the law itself in its entirety* which is meant, but *the fact of having or of knowing the law*:—the strict way of expressing it would perhaps be, 'in the fact of possessing a law,' which, condensed into our less accurate English, would be in one word, *in the law*: viz., 'which thou possessest.'"—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 18.—[On the different interpretations of δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφέροντα, see the *Exeg. Notes*. Lange (with Tholuck, Fritzsche, Reiche, Rückert, Philippi, Alford) translates: *Du beurtheilest die widerstreitenden Dinge*. Tholuck: *Du prüfst das Unterschiedene*. Tyndale: *Hast experience of good and bad*. Conybeare and Howson: *Givest judgment upon good or evil*. Robert Young, too literally: *Dost approve the distinctions*. But the versions of Cranmer, Geneva, James, Rheims, and Am. Bible Union agree substantially with the Latin Vulg.: *Probas utiliora*. So also Meyer, who translates: *Du billigst das Vorzügliche*. Wordsworth: *Thou discernest the things that are more excellent*. The same phrase occurs, Phil. i. 10, where the E. V. renders it in the same way. Grammatically, both interpretations are correct, and hence the connection must decide. δοκιμάζειν means first *to examine, to try, to prove* (1 Cor. iii. 13; 1 Peter i. 7); and then, as the result of examination and trial, *to discern, to distinguish*, and *to approve* (1 Cor. xvi. 3; Rom. xiv. 22). διαφέρειν is: (1.) *To differ*; (2.) *to differ to advantage, to excel*. Hence τὰ διαφέροντα: (1.) The difference between right and wrong, good and bad; (2.) the excellent things, *utilia*.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 22.—[Alford translates: *Thou who abhorrest idols, dost thou rob their temples?* To maintain the contrast, he refers (with Chrysostom, Meyer, Tholuck, and others) ἱεροσυλεῖς to the robbing of *idol* temples (εἴδωλα); but this was no sacrilege in the eyes of the Jew; and hence others refer it to the temple of God in Jerusalem. See *Exeg. Notes*.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 23.—[Lange and Meyer take this verse as a categorical charge, resulting from the preceding questions which the Jew could not deny. This view is supported by the following γάρ. παράβασις, in the six other passages of the N. T where it occurs, is uniformly translated *transgression* in the E V.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The connection with the foregoing is explained by Tholuck [p. 110] thus: "The Jew was already humbled by the proof that the Gentile was also in possession of the law. But it is further charged upon him that *his* possession of the law has become a dishonor to Him who gave it to him." We have seen already that the connection consists in a sharp antithesis: a Gentile who is a Jew at heart; a Jew who, according to the spirit of the law, is the most wanton Gentile. [Estius justly calls the following apostrophe, "*oratio splendida ac vehemens.*"]

Ver. 17. **But if thou art named a Jew.** There seems to be an anacoluthon in the following verses, which it was probably intended to remove by the reading *ἰδέ*. Tholuck: "The apodosis appears to be wanting to the protasis, vers. 17–20." But we may explain without an anacoluthon (Meyer): "But if thou art called a Jew, &c. . . . thou therefore (οὖν, ver. 21, in consequence of what has been said, who teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?" We would find an easier solution, if we could read the verbs ἐπονομάζῃ and ἐπαναπαύῃ as conjunctives for the formation of a hypothetical protasis; the following indicatives would then constitute the apodosis. But the ἄν is wanting to the εἰ. [See *Textual Note* [1].]—**Named.** *Jew* was the designation of the Hebrew according to his religion; therefore the theocratic name of honor, which is also contained in the etymology of the word itself.* Ἐπονομάζῃ is translated *cognominaris* by the Vulgate and Bengel. [Wordsworth: ἐπ—ονομάζῃ, thou hast a title *in addition to* (ἐπί) that which other men possess.—P. S.] But the compound verb is also used in the sense of the simple ὀνομάζειν, and the name Ἰουδαῖος was not a surname, although it might become a surname for the false Jew. Tholuck [Meyer, Philippi, Hodge; comp. LXX. Gen. iv. 17, 25, 26, and the classical quotations of Meyer *in loc.*—P. S.].—**And restest.** Intimation of Jewish pride. Strictly: Thou liest on it for rest. Thus the Jew abused his privilege; Ps. cxlvii. 19, 20.—Israel perverted into a false trust its ideal destination for the nations, according to Isa. xlii. 6, 7, and other passages; and it so caricatured the single elements (which are designated in the following verses) of this destination, that the most glaring moral contradiction took place in its character.—**Thou makest thy boast† in God,** as thy [exclusive] guardian God; Isa. xlv. 25; Jer. xxxi. 33. [To boast or glory in God, or in Christ (Gal. vi. 14), is right, if it proceeds from a sense of our weakness and unworthiness, and a corresponding sense of the goodness of God, as our sure refuge and strength; but it is wrong if it arises from religious bigotry and conceit, which would monopolize the favor of God to the exclusion of others. Calvin: "*Hæc igitur non cordis gloriatio, sed linguæ jactantia fuit.*" The false Jewish boasting in God amounted to a boasting in the flesh, against which we are warned, Gal. vi. 13; 2 Cor. x. 15; Phil. iii. 3. Ἰουδαῖος ἐπονομάζῃ—καὶ ἐπαναπαύσῃ νόμῳ—καὶ καυχᾶσαι ἐν θεῷ, form a rising climax.—P. S.]

Ver. 18. **And knowest his will** [τὸ θέλημα is emphatic.—P. S.] That is, His will as the inward part of the law; Eph. iii. 18, &c.; or rather, the absolute will which has become manifest in the law.—**And discernest the things that differ** [δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφέροντα]. Three explanations of this expression: 1. The difference between right and wrong (Theodoret, Theophylact, Grotius, &c., Tholuck, Philippi, and others); 2. what is at variance with the will of God, sinful (Clericus, Glöckler); 3. thou approvest the excellent (Vulgate: *probas utiliora*, Bengel, Meyer [Hodge]). According to the meaning of διαφέρειν (to be prominent; to be distinguished; to excel), and διαφέροντα (the distinctions; the excellent), these different explanations are equally allowable; and the connection must therefore determine which is the best one. But the explanation: thou approvest the excellent, is not strong enough; although Meyer sees in it the completion of a climax.* The Jew was, as פָּרַשׁ,† the distinguishing, the sharply deciding between what was allowed and disallowed; he was skilled in the διάκρισις καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ, Heb. v. 14; the διαστολὴ ἁγίων καὶ βεβήλων [a term frequently used by Philo]. This explanation passes over into a fourth: τὰ διαφέροντα, the controversies (De Dieu, Wolf).—**Being instructed.** After his fashion he lives in the law, κατηχούμενος, not κατηχηθείς. [*Being instructed*, not only catechetically in youth, but didactically and continually by the reading and exposition of the Scriptures in the synagogue on the Sabbath day.—P. S.]

Ver. 19. **And art confident.** He should be every thing that follows, according to Old Testament intimations; see Isa. xlii. 6, 7, and other passages. So much less is there a reason why Reiche should find here reminiscences from the Gospels (Matt. xv. 14; Luke xx. 32). The corruption of Judaism consisted throughout in perverting the Old Testament attributes of the people, and of its future, into the literal and the carnal. From this arose also its proselytism (Matt. xxiii. 15), which is here described.—**Guide of the blind.** The Jew called the Gentiles blind; σκότος, in Isa. lx. 2, means, therefore, the Gentiles; and φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν, in Isa. xlix. 6, means the Jews; νήπιοι, the proselytes (see Tholuck).

Ver. 20. **Form (pattern) of knowledge.** μόρφωσις—classically, μόρφωμα; Hesychius: σχηματισμός. [In the New Testament it occurs only once more—2 Tim. iii. 5—where it is opposed

* [יְהוּדָה is the verbal noun from the future hophal of יָדָה, *to praise*, and means *praised*, sc. Jah, God (*Gottlob*); see Fürst, *Dict.*, sub יָהּ, vol. i. 491; Gen. xxix. 35 (where Leah, after the birth of Judah, says: "Now will I praise the Lord: therefore she called his name *Judah*"); xlix. 8; Rev. ii. 9. To be a Jew in this proper sense was to belong to the covenant people of God selected for His praise. —P. S.]

† [Καυχᾶσαι (also in 1 Cor. iv. 7), like κατακαυχᾶσαι, Rom. xi. 18, δύνασαι (for δύνῃ), Matt. v. 36, ὀδυνᾶσαι, Luke xvi. 25, is the original uncontracted form for καυχᾷ, in use with the poets and later prose-writers, see Winer, *Gram.*, p. 73, 7th ed. The ἐν signifies the sphere in which the boasting moves, or the object of boasting, as χαίρειν ἐν.—P. S.]

* [So does Hodge: "To approve of what is right, is a higher attainment than merely to discriminate between good and evil." But there is a difference between an instinctive and an intelligent approval of what is right. The latter is the result of reflection and discrimination, resting on superior knowledge, which was the peculiar advantage of the Jew having the touchstone of the written law and the continual instruction of the Scriptures. What immediately follows agrees better with the interpretation of Lange. Comp. *Textual Note* [3].—P. S.]

† [פָּרַשׁ, to distinguish, clearly to discern, also to separate. From this the term *Pharisee* (*Perishin*, the Aramaic form of the Hebrew *Párushim*, "separated") is derived.—P. S.]

to δύναμις, and means the mere outward form or appearance. Here, on the contrary, it is the real representation or expression, *exemplar, effigies*. Grotius: *forma quæ rem exprimit*.—P. S.] According to Meyer, the doctrines and commandments of the law itself are the form of knowledge and truth. We are nearer right when we remember the didactic *impression* of the Old Testament revelation of the law in the rabbinical tradition from which the Talmud subsequently arose; for the Apostle speaks of a μόρφωσις τῆς γνώσεως, which should be indirectly μόρφ. τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ. Œcumenius and Olshausen, without cause, think of the typical character of the Old Testament; others (with Theophylact) of the mere phantom of truth. The question is concerning an object of which the Jew boasts. His μόρφωσις is indeed the gloomy antitype of the personal incarnation of the truth in Christ, as in Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 25 (23) we read of the σοφία becoming a book in the Thora. All these are now the characteristics of the Jew's pretensions. There now follow the proofs of the contradiction in which he stands to himself.

Ver 21. **Thou, then, that teachest another.** [The virtual apodosis of ver. 17. The several clauses are more lively and forcible if read interrogatively, so as to challenge the Jew to deny the charge, if he dare.—P. S.] The analogy of the following charges to the Apostle's judgment on the Gentiles lies herein: the Jews, by their pride of the law and by their legal orthodoxy, were led into the way of ruin, just as the Gentiles had been by their intellectual conceit indulging in symbols and myths. The first charge is general: **Teachest thou not thyself?** Ps. l. 16. After this, three specific charges follow in strong gradation. Meyer: "The following infinitives [μὴ κλέπτειν, μὴ μοιχεύειν] do not include in themselves the idea of δεῖν or ἐξεῖναι, but are explained by the idea of command which is implied in the finite verbs" [viz., κλέπτεις, μοιχεύεις. The *verba jubendi* here are κηρύσσων and λέγων.—P. S.] In the charge of stealing, there was undoubtedly special reference to the passionate and treacherous method of transacting business adopted by the Jews (James iv. 13); in the charge of adultery, to the loose practice of divorces (Matt. xix. 8, 9; James iv. 4).—[*Μοιχεύεις*. The Talmud charges adultery upon some of the most celebrated Rabbins, as Akiba, Meir, Eleasar.—P. S.] The strongest charge is the third:

Ver. 22. **Thou that abhorrest idols**, &c. *Βδελύσσομαι*, from βδελύσσω, to excite disgust by a loathsome odor. In the religious sense, to abhor. The Jew called the idols βδελύγματα (1 Mac. vi. 7; 2 Kings xxiii. 13, תּוֹעֵבוֹת). Explanations: 1. By plundering the temples of idols (Chrysostom, Theophylact, and many others; Meyer, Philippi [Alford, Conybeare and Howson]). Tholuck: "The law, in Deut. vii. 25, forbids the appropriation of the gold and silver ornaments of the images of gods; and in the paraphrase of this prohibition in Josephus (*Antiq.* iv. 8, 10), express reference is made to the robbing of heathen temples. Acts xix. 36, 37, shows that the Jews had the name of committing such an offence." [The objection to this view is, that the Jew, attaching no sacredness to the temples of idols, regarded the despoiling of heathen temples as no sacrilege, but simply as robbery, which might be justified under certain circumstances.—P. S.]. 2. ἱεροσυλεῖν in the figurative sense: *profanatio majestatis divinæ* (Calvin, Luther, Bengel, Köllner).* 3. Embezzlement of taxes [tithes and offerings] for their own temple (Pelagius, Grotius [Ewald, Wordsworth, and others; comp. Mal. i. 8, 12, 14; iii. 8–10]). To the charge of robbing heathen temples, the idea of pollution—which this robbery carries with it—may also be added, as is done by Meyer. But it seems strange that the Apostle should have established, on isolated occurrences of such robbery, so general and fearful a charge. As in the charges: "Thou stealest, thou committest adultery," he had not merely in mind occasional great transgressions, but also the universal exhibitions of Jewish avarice and concupiscence, so we must also here accept a more general and spiritual significance of his accusation. We must indeed suppose here transgressions that were an occasion of offence to the Gentiles; and Luther goes much too far in spiritualizing the charge: "Thou art a robber of God; for it is God's honor that all those who rely on good works would take from Him." But the worst outrage on the temple, according to John ii. 19, consisted in the crucifixion of Christ (comp. James v. 6). It was therefore as a sign of judgment that the temple in Jerusalem itself was desecrated by the Jews in every possible way before its destruction. In a wider sense, the transgression of the Jews consisted in their causing, by their fanaticism, not only the downfall of the temple, but in frivolously abusing and insulting the sanctuaries of Gentiles, and, where occasion offered, in converting their treasures into spoils and articles of commerce.

Ver. 23. **Thou that makest thy boast in the law.** Since this judgment is the result of the foregoing question, Meyer has good reason for reading this verse not as a question, but as a categorical impeachment. This is supported by the γάρ in ver. 24.

Ver. 24. **For the name of God.** That is, the Gentiles judged the religion of the Jews by the scandalous conduct of the Jews themselves, and thus were led to blaspheme their God, Jehovah. The Jews boasted of the law (which, Baruch iv. 3, is termed ἡ δόξα τοῦ Ἰακώβ), and reflected disgrace on the lawgiver. For the Jews, the Apostle here seals again his declaration, by concluding with a quotation from the Old Testament—Isa. lii. 5: "My name continually every day is blasphemed" [in the Septuagint: δι' ὑμᾶς διαπαντὸς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι]. Comp. Ezek. xxxvi. 23: "I will sanctify my great name, which was profaned among the heathen, which ye have profaned in the midst of them."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Apostle now passes over from his indirect representation of the corruption in Judaism, which he had given from a general point of view, vers. 10–16, to paint its life-picture from experience. In chap. iii. 10–19, he proves that the Old Testament had already testified to the corruption of the Jewish people. But this description of the actual corruption must be distinguished from the sketch of the original transgression, chap. v. 12 ff., and from the development in part of the judgment of hard-heartedness, chaps. ix. and x.

* [So Hodge: "The essence of idolatry was profanation of God; of this the Jews were in a high degree guilty. They had made His house a den of thieves."—P. S.]

2. The description of the corruption in Judaism presents only legalistic features, as the account of Gentile corruption presents Antinomian features. In the former case, the disfiguration of religion proceeded from legal conceit, while in the latter it arose from the conceit of wisdom; the root of pride is therefore common to both lines of corruption. The self-contradiction of the Gentiles was developed thus: he, the pretended wise man, becomes a fool by disfiguring his symbolical religion of nature; with all his self-glory, he becomes a worshipper of the creature, and loses the dignity of his human body; with all his deification of nature, he sinks thereby into abominable unnaturalness; with all his efforts for vigor of life and enthusiasm, he sinks more and more into the degradation of wicked characters; and finally, with all his better knowledge, he ornaments and varnishes sin theoretically and æsthetically. The self-contradiction of the Jew, on the other hand, developed itself thus: he, the pretended teacher of the nations, becomes an Antinomian blasphemer, by the perversion of his religion of revelation and law, while he teaches others, and not himself, and, by a succession of transgressions of the law, goes so far as to profane sacred things, by abusing and robbing the temples (see Matt. xxi. 13). To the profanation of the temple was added that of the high-priesthood, which reached its climax in Caiaphas. Likewise the ministry of the Jew was thoroughly profaned by proselytism and falsification of the law, and his religiousness was converted into a cloak for hypocrisy.

3. The fanatic grows ever more profane by the consistency of his course of conduct—a despiser of the substantial possessions of religion. Church history furnishes numerous examples, how fanatics of the churchly as well as unchurchly type become at last, out of pretended saints, profaners and robbers of the temple.

4. Priests and preachers have certainly corrupted religion as often as philosophers have corrupted wisdom, politicians the State, jurists the law, &c.

5. The dogmatic and legalistic spirit of the Middle Ages, too, which, in a better form, was really a "teacher of the blind," has finally gone so far as to present the greatest variety of religious and moral hindrances to modern Gentiles. It is not without serious significance, therefore, that the Epistle to the Romans contains this very section.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The false zeal for the law practised by the Jews as occasion for blaspheming the name of God by the Gentiles: so far as, 1. such false zeal knows God's will; but, 2. wantonly transgresses it (vers. 17–24).—The mere name of Christianity goes no further than the name of Judaism (vers. 17–24).—Do not depend upon your orthodoxy, if you do not act right by faith (vers. 17–24).—Notwithstanding brilliant knowledge, one is a bad teacher if he does not do what he knows (vers. 17–24).—Blasphemy of the name of God (ver. 24).—God's name has already been often blasphemed among the heathen (and Mohammedans) because of Christians. Proof: 1. From the outrages of persons professing Christianity in the Middle Ages (Charlemagne, and the Saxons, the Brethren of the Sword, the Spaniards in America, &c.); 2. from the abuses in trade in the present time (the slave trade, opium trade, sandal-wood trade).

STARKE: When one does any thing which has ever so good appearance, it is sin if it does not come from faith (ver. 18)—Theological learning is by no means enough for a teacher, when he is not taught in the school of the Holy Spirit (ver. 20).—That teacher cannot be an example of good works who can only say of himself: "Judge according to my words, and not according to my deeds" (ver. 21).—Boasting and vain-glory—the manner, alas, of many Christians! (ver. 23.)—CRAMER: The titles and names of honor that we may possess should be to us a continual reminder to conduct ourselves in harmony with such titles (ver. 17).—*Nova Bibl. Tub.*: Oh, how many external privileges a soul can have! Communion in the true Church, knowledge of God and His word, of His will and His works, the best instruction, a skilful sense of the difference between good and evil; and yet, in spite of all this, it can be at fault, and quite removed from the inner fellowship with God (ver. 17).—Look, teacher! You must commence with yourself; you must first be your own teacher, guide, and chastiser; first preach to your own self, first break your own will, and perform what you preach. But to desire to guide, discipline, and control others, and yet steal and commit adultery yourself, &c.—that will enter in judgment against you. Oh, how great is this corruption! (ver. 20.)—QUESNEL: Oh, how rare a thing it is to be learned without being proud! (ver. 19).

HEUBNER: There is a false and a true boasting on the part of a believer in revelation. He does it falsely when he imagines, 1. that he thereby makes himself more acceptable to God; 2. that merely having and knowing are sufficient, without practice; 3. when, at the same time, he despises others. He boasts properly when, 1. he gives God all the glory; 2. makes use of the revealed truth; 3. does not despise others (ver. 17).—It is a great grace when God gives a tender conscience (ver. 18).—To know the right, is in the power of every Christian; and sin does not consist in ignorance or misunderstanding, but has its root in the will (ver. 19).—Melancholy contradiction between knowledge and deeds (vers. 21–23).—The honor of Christianity is dependent upon us.—A holy life is the final vindication of faith (ver. 24).

BESSER: Legalists, who would be righteous by their works, deprive the law of its spiritual clearness (ver. 17).

LANGE: The internal self-contradiction between knowledge and disposition extends to external life: 1. As self-contradiction between word and deed; 2. between the vocation and the discharge of it; 3. between destination to the welfare of the world, and degeneration, on the contrary, to the misery of the world.—The teacher of the law in olden times, and the (religious) teacher of the law in recent days—the offence of modern Gentiles.

[BURKITT: Vers. 17–20. Learn: 1. That persons are very prone to be proud of church privileges, glorying in the letter of the law, but not conformed to its spirituality either in heart or life; and 2. that gifts, duties, and supposed graces, are the stay and staff which hypocrites lean on. The duties which Christ has appointed, are the trust and rest of the hypocrite; but Christ Himself is the trust and rest of the upright.—Vers. 21–24. 1. It is much easier to instruct and teach others, than to be instructed ourselves; 2. it is both sinful and shameful to teach others the right way, and to go in the wrong ourselves. While this is a double fault in a private person, it is inexcusable in the teacher

3. the name of God suffers by none so much as by those who preach and press the duties of Christianity upon others, but do not practise them themselves. The sins of teachers are teaching sins. Lord, let all that administer unto Thee in holy things consider that they have not only their own sins to account for, but also the sins of their people, if committed by their profligate example.—MATTHEW HENRY: The greatest obstructors of the success of the Word, are those whose bad lives contradict their good doctrine; who in the pulpit preach so well, that it is a pity they should ever come out; and out of the pulpit live so ill, that it is a pity they should ever come in.—DODDRIDGE: We pity the Gentiles, and we have reason to do it; for they are lamentably blind and dissolute: but let us take heed lest those appearances of virtue which are to be found among some of them condemn us, who, with the letter of the law and the gospel, and with the solemn tokens of a covenant relation to God, transgress His precepts, and violate our engagements to Him, so turning the means of goodness and happiness into the occasion of more aggravated guilt and misery.—CLARKE: Ver. 17. It is the highest honor to be called to know God's name, and be employed in His service.—HODGE (condensed): The sins of the professing people of God are peculiarly offensive to Him, and injurious to our fellow-men.—The sins and refuges of men are alike in all ages.—Were it ever so certain that the church to which we belong is the true, apostolic, universal Church, it remains no less certain, that without holiness no man shall see the Lord.—BARNES: It matters little what a man's speculative opinions may be; his practice may do far more to disgrace religion, than his profession does to honor it.—J. F. H.]

CHAPTER II. 25-29.—III. 1-20.

FIFTH SECTION.—*The external Judaism of the letter, and the internal Judaism of the spirit. The* OBJECTIVE *advantage of historical Judaism. The* SUBJECTIVE *equality of Jews and Gentiles before the law of God, according to the purpose of the law itself—to bring about the knowledge of sin. (The utility of circumcision;—an accommodation to the need of salvation by the knowledge of sin. The circumcision which becomes uncircumcision, and the uncircumcision which becomes circumcision; or, the external Jew possibly an internal Gentile, while the external Gentile may be an internal Jew. Not the mere possession of the law, but fidelity to the law, is of avail. The latter does not create pride of the law, but knowledge of sin—that is, the need of salvation. The advantage of circumcision therefore consists in this, that to the Jew were committed the oracles of God—that law by which all men are represented in the guilt of sin. Sin, as acknowledged guilt, represented in contrast with the law.)*

CHAP. II. 25-29.

25 For circumcision verily [indeed] profiteth, if thou keep [keepest] the law: but
if thou be [art] a breaker [transgressor] of the law, thy circumcision is made [has
26 become, or, is turned into] uncircumcision. Therefore, if the uncircumcision
[so called, *i. e.*, the uncircumcised] keep the righteousness [decrees, commandments, moral
requirements, δικαιώματα] of the law, shall [will] not his uncircumcision be
27 counted for circumcision? And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature,
if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by[1] the letter and circumcision dost trans-
gress the law? [He who is uncircumcised by nature, if he fulfils the law, will
even judge thee, who, with the letter and circumcision, dost transgress the
28 law.][2] For he is not a Jew, which [who] is one outwardly; neither *is that*
29 circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he *is* a Jew, which [who]
is one inwardly; and circumcision *is that* of the heart, in the spirit, *and*
[*omit* and] not in the letter; whose praise *is* not of men, but of God.

CHAP. III. 1-20.

1 What advantage then hath [What, then, is the advantage of] the Jew?
2 or what profit *is there* [what *is* the benefit] of circumcision? Much every
way: chiefly, [First, indeed,][3] because that unto them were committed [they
3 —*i. e.*, the Jews—were entrusted with, ἐπιστεύθησαν] the oracles of God. For
what [What, then,][4] if some did not believe [were faithless]? shall their un
belief [faithlessness, or, unfaithfulness] make the faith of God without effect
4 [destroy, or, nullify the faithfulness of God]?[5] God forbid: [Let it not be!][6]
yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, "That thou might-
est [mayest] be justified in thy sayings, and mightest [mayest] overcome when
5 thou art judged"[7] [Ps. li. 4]. But if our unrighteousness commend [doth

establish][a] the righteousness of God, what shall we say? *Is* God unrighteous
who taketh vengeance [who is inflicting, or, bringing down, the wrath, ὁ ἐπιφέρων
τὴν ὀργήν]?[a] (I speak as a man [after the manner of men, κατὰ ἄνθρωπον].)
6 God forbid: [Let it not be!] for then how shall God judge the world?
7 For [But] if[10] the truth [covenant-faithfulness] of God hath more abounded through
my lie [was made the more conspicuous by means of my falsehood, unfaithful-
ness] unto his glory [chap. v. 20]; why yet [still, any longer] am I also judged as
8 a sinner? And not *rather*, (as we be [are] slanderously [blasphemously] re
ported, and as some affirm that we say,) Let us do evil, that good may come?[1]
whose damnation [condemnation, judgment][12] is just.
9 What then? are we better *than they?*[13] No, in no wise [Not at all]
for we have before proved [charged] both Jews and Gentiles, that they are
10 [to be] all under sin; As it is written, "There is none righteous, no, not one:
11 There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God.
12 They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there
13 is none that doeth good, no, not one" [Ps. xiv. 1-3].[14] "Their throat *is* an open
sepulchre;[15] with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps *is*
14 under their lips" [Ps. v. 9; cxl. 3].[16] "Whose mouth *is* full of cursing and bitter-
15, 16 ness" [Ps. x. 7]:[17] "Their feet *are* swift to shed blood: Destruction and
17 misery *are* in their ways: And the way of peace have they not known"
18 [Isa. lix. 7, 8]:[18] "There is no fear of God before their eyes" [Ps. xxxvi. 1].[19]
19 Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who
are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may
20 become guilty before God. [,] Therefore [because] by[20] the deeds of the law
there shall no flesh be justified [by works of the law no flesh (*i. e.*, no person) shall
(can) be declared righteous] in his sight:[21] for [. For] by the law *is* the
knowledge of sin [*comes* a knowledge of sin].

TEXTUAL.

[a] Ver. 27.—[The E. V. here, as often, follows Beza, who translates διά, *per*, which is its fundamental meaning when it rules the genitive. But here it expresses the state or the circumstances under which the transgression takes place—*i. e.*, *with* or *in spite of*, *notwithstanding*, the written law and circumcision; comp. δι' ὑπομονῆς, with patience; δι' ἀκροβυστίας, while in circumcision, Rom. iv. 11; διὰ προσκόμματος, with offence, xiv. 20; and Winer, *Gramm.*, 7th ed., p. 355 f.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 27.—[Lange, with Erasmus, Luther, Bengel, De Wette, Meyer, Tholuck (ed. 5), Alford, and others, takes ver. 27 to be categorical, and makes a period after "law." Hence κρινεῖ is emphatically put first, and καί has the sense of *even*: *Yea, verily, he will even condemn you.* The E. V. regards ver. 27 as a continuation of the question in ver. 26, and supplies οὐχί before κρινεῖ. So also Fritzsche, Olshausen, Luther, Philippi, Ewald, Wordsworth.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 2.—[Πρῶτον μὲν γάρ. ℵ. A. D.[3] K. L., Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Lange, insert γάρ, *namely*, after μέν; B. D.* G., Vulg., Syr., Lachmann, omit it. πρῶτον, *first*, *in the first place*, is not followed by *secondly*, &c.; comp. πρῶτον μέν, i. 8. To avoid the anacoluthon, Calvin translates: *præcipue*; Beza: *primarium illud est.* So also the E. V. and Dr. Lange.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 3.—[Τί γάρ; a phrase used to start an objection for the purpose of answering it, or to vindicate a previous assertion; comp. Phil. i. 18.—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 3.—[ἠπίστησαν—ἀπιστία—πίστιν, should be rendered so as to retain the paronomasia. Lange: *Denn wie? Wenn etliche die Glaubenstreue brechen, sollte ihr Treubruch die Treue Gottes aufheben?*—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 4.—[Or, *Far be it*, *far from it*, *by no means*; Vulg., *absit*; German: *es werde nicht*, or (Luther, Lange), *das sei ferne!* The phrase, μὴ γένοιτο, is an expression of strong denial or pious horror, corresponding to the Hebrew חָלִילָה (Gen. xliv. 17: Jos. xxii. 29; 1 Sam. xx. 2), and occurs fourteen times in Paul's Epistles—ten times in Romans (iii. 4, 6, 31; vi. 2, 15; vii. 7, 13; ix. 14; xi. 1, 11), three times in Galatians (ii. 17; iii. 21; vi. 14), and once in 1 Cor. vi. 15; but elsewhere in the N. T. only Luke xx. 16. It is also used by Polybius, Arian, and the later Greek writers. The *God forbid* of the Authorized Version (like the German *Gott behüte*, *Gott bewahre*) is almost profane, though very expressive, and in keeping with old English usage; for we find it in all the earlier E. Vv., including that of Wiclif, and also that of Rheims. Wordsworth's rendering: "*Heaven* forbid that this should be so," is hardly an improvement. Remember the third commandment, as explained by Christ, Matt. v. 34.—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 4.—[Or, *in Thy judging*, *when Thou judgest*, as the E. V. has it in Ps. li. 4. The active rendering of ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαι (middle, in the sense of *litigare*) corresponds to the Hebrew בְּשָׁפְטֶךָ, Ps. li. 4 (comp. LXX.; Job xiii. 19; Isa. xliii. 26; Jer. ii. 35; Matt. v. 40; 1 Cor. vi. 1, 6), and is defended in this passage by Beza, Bengel, Tholuck, Meyer, and Ewald; while Vulg., Luther, Lange, Hodge, &c., prefer the passive rendering: *when Thou art judged.* See *Exeg. Notes.* The quotation is from the penitential Psalm of David, composed after his double crime of adultery and murder, and reads in Hebrew thus:

לְךָ לְבַדְּךָ חָטָאתִי
וְהָרַע בְּעֵינֶיךָ עָשִׂיתִי
לְמַעַן תִּצְדַּק בְּדָבְרֶךָ
תִּזְכֶּה בְשָׁפְטֶךָ

Literally:

"To Thee, Thee only, I have sinned,
And done the evil in Thine eyes,
In order that Thou mayest be just in Thy speaking,
And pure in Thy judging."

Paul follows the translation of the Septuagint, which renders תִּצְדַּק by δικαιωθῇς (that Thou mayest be justified—*i. e.* be accounted, declared just), substitutes νικήσῃς (that Thou mayest conquer, prevail judicially in Thy cause) for תִּזְכֶּה (be clear, pure), and takes the active בְּשָׁפְטֶךָ in the passive, or more probably in the middle sense, ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε. The sentiment is not materially altered. The apostles, in their citations, frequently depart from the letter of the Hebrew, being careful only to give the mind of the Holy Spirit.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 5.—[Συνίστημι, *to make stand with, to place together* (*constituo, colloco*); and thence of persons, *to introduce, to commend* by letter (xvi. 1; 2 Cor. iii. 1); trop., *to set forth, to make conspicuous, to prove;* so here, and Rom. v. 8, συνίστησι τὴν . . . ἀγάπην; 2 Cor. vi. 4, συνιστῶντες ἑαυτοὺς ὡς θεοῦ διάκονοι; Gal. ii. 18, παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνίστημι, and often in Polybius, Philo, and Josephus.—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 5.—[Cod. Sin.[1] adds αὐτοῦ after ὀργήν, *His* wrath. The other authorities omit it. The article before ὀργήν points to the well-known wrath on the day of judgment, and in the moral government of the world.—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 7.—[The usual reading is, εἰ γάρ; but Cod. Sin. reads, εἰ δέ. Lange, in his translation, reads, *wenn nämlich;* but in the *Exeg. Notes: wenn aber.* See his explanation of the difficult passage.—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 8.—[Dr. Lange makes a period after *come*, and translates: *And so let us by no means—as we are blasphemously charged, and as some pretend that we say—do evil, that good may come! The condemnation of such is just.* See the *Exeg. Notes.* But nearly all the commentators regard ver. 8 as a continuation of the question commenced in ver. 7, and assume an irregularity of construction. Ποιήσωμεν, then, instead of being connected with καὶ (τί)μή at the beginning of ver. 8, is connected by ὅτι with the preceding λέγειν. "And why do we not rather say, as we are blasphemously reported (βλασφημούμεθα), and as some give out that we do say, 'Let us do the evil things (τὰ κακά), that the good ones (τὰ ἀγαθά) may come!' —whose judgment is just."—P. S.]

[12] Ver. 8.—[Conybeare and Howson: *Of such men the doom is just.* Κρίμα occurs twenty-eight times in the N. T. and is generally correctly rendered: *judgment*, in the E. V. The word *damnation*, in old English, was used in the sense of *condemnation, censure*, but is now equivalent to: *condemnation to everlasting punishment*, or *state of everlasting punishment.* Hence the E. V. here conveys a false meaning to the popular reader, as also in Rom. xiii. 2 ("shall receive to themselves *judgment*," *i. e.*, here *temporal* punishment by the magistrate) and 1 Cor. xi. 29 ("eateth and drinketh *judgment* to himself").—P. S.]

[13] Ver. 9.—προκατέχομεν περισσόν is a gloss [D.* G., Syr. On the different interpretations of προεχόμεθα, comp. the *Exeg. Notes.* προέχω, in the active voice, means: *to hold before*, or intransitively, *to surpass, to excel;* in the middle voice: *to hold before one's self*—either literally, *i. e.*, a shield, or figuratively, in the sense, *to use as a pretext;* in the passive voice: *to be surpassed.*—P. S.]

[14] Vers. 10-12.—[Literal version of Ps. xiv. 1-3 from the Hebrew:

"A fool hath said in his heart,
'*There is* no God.'
They are corrupt,
They have done abominable things,
There is not a doer of good.
Jehovah from the heavens
Hath looked on the children of men,
To see if there is a wise one, seeking God.
The whole have turned aside,
Together they have become worthless:
There is not a doer of good, not even one."—P. S.]

[15] Ver. 13.—[Ps. v. 9, according to the Hebrew:

"There is no stability in their mouth;
Their heart *is full* of mischief;
An open grave *is* their throat;
Their tongues they make smooth."—P. S.]

[16] Ver. 13.—[Ps. cxl. 3 in Hebrew:

"They have sharpened their tongues as a serpent;
Poison of an adder *is* under their lips."—P. S.]

[17] Ver. 14.—[Ps. x. 7:

"His mouth is full of oaths,
And deceit, and fraud."—P. S.]

[18] Ver. 15-17.—[From Isa. lix. 7, 8, which reads literally:

"Their feet run to do evil,
And they haste to shed innocent blood;
Their thoughts *are* thoughts of iniquity;
Wasting and destruction are in their highways;
A way of peace they have not known,
And there is no judgment in their paths.
Their paths they have made perverse for themselves;
No treader in it hath known peace."—P. S.]

[19] Ver. 18.—[Ps. xxxvi. 1:

"The transgression of the wicked
Is affirming within my heart:
'Fear of God is not before his eyes.'"—P. S.]

[20] Ver. 20.—[Διότι may mean, (1.) δι' ὅ τι, *propter quod, quam ob rem, quare, weshalb, weswegen, on account of which thing, wherefore* (relative), or, in the beginning of a period, *desshalb, therefore*—indicating a *conclusion* from preceding premises. This is the prevailing, though not exclusive meaning, among the Greek classics; while in the N. T. διό is always used in this sense. (2.) διὰ τοῦτο ὅτι, *propterea quod, desshalb weil, on this account that,* or simply ὅτι, *quia, nam, because, for*—assigning a *reason* for a preceding assertion. Both views suit the connection, but the latter is more consistent with the uniform use of this particle in the N. T., and is adopted by the majority of modern commentators, also by Meyer, Lange, Alford, Wordsworth, Hodge. Hence a comma only should be put after θεῷ. Διότι occurs twenty-two times in the N. T. The authorized E. V. translates it eight times *for*, thirteen times *because*, and only once *therefore*—viz., in our passage, following Beza (*propterea*). See the passages in Schmid-Bruder's *Concordantiæ*, and in *The Englishman's Greek Concordance*, and the *Textual Note* on Rom. i. 19.—P. S.]

[21] Ver. 20.—[ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, probably in allusion to Ps. cxliii. 2, LXX.: ὅτι οὐ δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν. The negation belongs not to πᾶσα, but to the verb, according to a Hebraizing syntactic connection. "All flesh shall not be justified" = "nobody shall be justified." Comp. Matt. xxiv. 22: οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Survey.—1. The use of circumcision. Its twofold operation, according to the conflicting conduct of the Jews. Its spiritual significance, by which the Gentile can be a Jew, and the Jew a Gentile; vers. 25–29. 2. The *objective* advantage of historical Judaism. The authority of the Word of God, which remains established by virtue of God's faithfulness to His covenant, though many of the Jews become unfaithful. By this unfaithfulness they must even cause the glory of God's faithfulness to abound. Nevertheless, the unfaithful are responsible for their guilt, and the application of the sin of unfaithfulness to the glory of God would be a wicked transgression; chap. iii. 1–8. 3. The *subjective* equality of the Jews with the Gentiles. In a subjective relation, the former have no advantage, since, according to the witnesses of the Old Testament, they are in a severe condemnation. The conclusion: All the world stands guilty before God; vers. 9–20.—The whole section contains, briefly, the three points: 1. Circumcision (Judaism) is conditionally either an advantage, or not; 2. as far as the designed mission of Judaism was concerned, it was an advantage; 3. from the conduct of the Jews, as opposed to the righteousness of God, it was no advantage.

First Paragraph (vers. 25–29).

Ver. 25. **For circumcision indeed profiteth** (or **availeth**). After the Apostle has portrayed the corruption of the Jews, he comes to the objection of Jewish theology, or also to the argument from the theocratic standpoint: What, then, is the prerogative of circumcision? Does not circumcision, as God's covenant promise, protect and sustain the Jews? Answer: The advantage of circumcision is (according to the nature of a covenant) conditional. It is actually available (not merely useful); it accomplishes its complete work when the circumcised *keep the law.* Plainly, circumcision here falls under the idea of a covenant. It is a mark of the covenant of the law, by which God will fulfil His promise to the Jew on condition that the Jew keep the law (see Exod. xix. 7, 8; Deut. xxvi. 16). But afterward the circumcision of God is made prominent as *God's institution;* it remains in force, though a part of the Jews become faithless to the covenant relation. But this rests upon its inner nature or symbolical significance, as a promise and pledge of the circumcision of the heart; that is, a continual sincerity and heartiness in the fulfilment of the law (Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6; Jer. iv. 4; Col. ii. 11; Acts vii. 51: "Uncircumcised in heart and ears"). The consequence is, that the one who is circumcised is received into the people of the covenant. But the idea of the people of the covenant gradually becomes more profound, just as that of the covenant and the new birth itself, as the time of their fulfilment in the New Testament approaches. It is from this point of view that the following discussion must also be explained.—It is *of use*—that is, it accomplishes what it should accomplish according to its original idea.—**If thou keep the law.** Here the question is plainly not concerning the perfect *fulfilment* of the *law* in the Jewish sense (Tholuck); which is opposed by vers. 26 and 15. Nor can the Apostle anticipate here so soon the New Testament standpoint of faith, according to which believers alone, including those from the Gentiles, have the real circumcision. He therefore means the fulfilment of the law according to the measure of sincerity and heartiness by which either Jew or Gentile is prepared to obey the truth of the gospel (vers. 7, 8).—**But if thou art a transgressor.** One of the mystical expositions of the Pentateuch, *Shamoth Rabbah* (from about the 6th century), expresses the same thought in the same figurative drapery: "The heretics and the ungodly in Israel should not say, 'Because we are circumcised, we do not descend to the Gehenna.' What does God do? He sends His angels, and brings back their uncircumcision, so that they descend to Gehenna" (Tholuck).* The expressions *transgressor* and *uncircumcision* were especially terrible to the Jews. Uncircumcision was the peculiar characteristic of the impurity of heathendom, as circumcision denoted the consecration and holiness of the Jewish people. But here it is stated, not merely that uncircumcision takes the place of circumcision, but that circumcision actually becomes uncircumcision. That is, the unbelieving Jew becomes virtually a Gentile. [What is here said of Jewish circumcision, is equally applicable to Christian baptism: it is a great blessing to the believer, as a sign and seal of the New Covenant, and a title to all its privileges, but it avails nothing, yea, it is turned into a curse, by the violation of the duties implied in this covenant.—P. S.]

Ver. 26. **Therefore, if the uncircumcision.** The Apostle here uses the Jew's mode of expression. *Ἀκροβυστία, uncircumcision*, stands in the first clause of the sentence as an abstract term for the concrete ἀκρόβυστος, *uncircumcised;* hence the αὐτοῦ [*i. e.*, of such an ἀκρόβυστος] after the second ἀκροβυστία).†—*Τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου.* The requirements of the law *in essential matters*, as τὰ τοῦ νόμ., ver. 14; as they can be observed by the Gentile also. [The *moral* requirements, not the ceremonial, among which circumcision was the very first. The E. V. here mistakes δικαίωμα for δικαιοσύνη.—P. S.] **Be counted for circumcision.** He shall be accepted as a Jew who is obedient to the law (Matt. viii. 11; 1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. v. 6). The clause is supposed by Philippi to apply to the Proselytes of the Gate. But these have ceased to be Gentiles in the full sense of the word. The point here throughout is not concerning the form, but the disposition. Fritzsche refers the future [λογισθήσεται] to the final judgment; but Meyer, and others, regard it as applying to the abstract future: "As often as the question concerns justification." Assuredly the Apostle has

* [Rabbi Berechias, in *Shemoth Rabb.*, fol. 138, col. 13: "*Ne hæretici et apostatæ et impii ex Israelitis dicant: quando quidem circumcisi sumus, in infernum non descendimus. Quid agit Deus S. B.? Mittit angelum et præputia eorum attrahit, ita ut ipsis in infernum descendant.*" *Attrahere*, or *adducere præputium*, means as much as to obliterate the circumcision, or to become uncircumcised. It was done by apostate Jews at the time of the Maccabees, under the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes; 1 Macc. i. 15; Josephus, *Antiq.* xii. 6, § 2. It was a common Jewish opinion, that circumcision, as such, saves from hell. Rabbi Menachem (*Comm. on the B. of Moses*, fol. 43, col. 3): "Our Rabbins have said, that no circumcised man will see hell." *Medrasch Tillin* (f. 7, c. 2): "God swore to Abraham, that no one who was circumcised should be sent to hell." See these, and similar passages, in Schöttgen and Eisenmenger (*Entdecktes Judenthum* ii. p. 339 f.)—P. S.]

† [The reverse is the case, John viii. 44: ψεύστης ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ, where the abstract noun ψεῦδους must be supplied from the concrete ψεύστης. Comp. Winer *Gramm.*, pp. 131, 132, 6th ed.—P. S.]

already in mind the definite future, the day when the gospel is preached.

Ver. 27. **And he who is uncircumcised by nature** [ἐκ φύσεως belongs to ἀκροβυστία, not to τελοῦσα] **will judge thee** [κρινεῖ, rise up in judgment by his example; comp. Matt. xii. 41, 42, where κατακρίνω is used]. Analogies to this bold word can be found in the Gospels, Matt. iii. 9; viii. 11; xii. 41, and others; and even back in the Old Testament. The sentence is read by many as a question, as the previous verse; while the οὐχὶ is again supplied in thought before κρινεῖ (Rückert, Tholuck [in the earlier editions, but not in the fifth.—P. S.], Lachmann, and others). On the contrary, as a declaration, it is a definite answer and conclusion to ver. 26 (Luther, Erasmus, De Wette, Meyer).—**Uncircumcised by nature.** The Gentile as he is by virtue of his natural birth, as is the Jew no less. The ἐκ φύσεως is erroneously made by Koppe to relate to τὸν νόμ. τελοῦσα; still more artificial is Olshausen's explanation: "The Gentile world observing the law without higher aid."—**Who with the letter** [διὰ γράμματος]. The διά reminds us of the declaration in chap. vii. 11: "For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me" (Œcumenius, Beza, and others). Yet it should be urged here, as Meyer properly remarks, that such a Jew, *in spite of the law*, transgresses it. But that he becomes a transgressor (παραβάτης), and not merely a sinner (ἁμαρτωλός), rests upon the fact that he is in possession and knowledge of the law (chap. v. 13, 14). The expression γράμμα defines the law in its specific character as written law [not in a disparaging sense, in opposition to πνεῦμα]; **circumcision** (περιτομή) is the appropriate obligation to the same.

Ver. 28. **For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly.** We here have a succession of brief utterances (*breviloquentia*).* Meyer translates: "For not he who is a Jew externally, is a [genuine] Jew." This means, in complete expression (according to De Wette and others): "Not the one who is a Jew externally is a Jew, that is, is on that account already a Jew internally, or a true Jew." Thus, also, the second clause of the verse should be understood: Neither is the circumcision which is external in the flesh, genuine circumcision; the external sign is not the reality: it is the symbolical mask of the reality. Tholuck: "Mark xii. 33, as well as other examples, prove that this view was not unknown to the Scribes." Yet even this, and the expression quoted from the Talmud—'The Jew consists in the innermost parts of the heart'*—is far from resembling this Pauline antithesis.

Ver. 29. **But he is a Jew who is one inwardly.** Explanations: 1. "He who is internally a Jew *is a Jew;* and the circumcision of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter, *is circumcision*" (De Wette, Tholuck, with Beza, Este, Rückert). Here the absent predicate is in the concluding word. 2. But he who is one inwardly, *is* a Jew, and circumcision of the heart *rests* in the spirit, not in the letter (Luther, Erasmus, Fritzsche, Meyer). In the first construction, the ellipses are very strong; in the second, circumcision of the heart creates an anticipation which is at variance with the parallelism. Therefore, 3. But he is a Jew (this is brought over from the preceding verse) who is a Jew inwardly; and circumcision (likewise brought ove. from the preceding) is circumcision of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter. We must therefore supply Ἰουδαῖος after ἀλλά, and περιτομή after καί.—**A Jew in secret,** ἐν κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος. The true theocratic disposition—that is, the direction of legality to heartiness, truth, and reality, and thus to the New Testament. This is not quite equal in degree to ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος (1 Peter iii. 4). Circumcision of the heart; see Deut. x. 16, &c.; Philo: σύμβολον ἡδονῶν ἐκτομῆς. **Circumcision of the heart** does not mean "the separation of every thing immoral from the inner life" (Meyer), but the mortification or breaking of the natural selfish principle of life, by faith, as the principle of theocratic consecration and direction. [Even the Old Testament plainly teaches the spiritual import of circumcision, and demands the circumcision of the *heart*, without which the external ceremony is worthless; Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6; Jer. iv. 4; ix. 29; Ezek. xliv. 9; comp. Col. ii. 11; Phil. iii. 2. The same may be applied to baptism, the sign and seal of regeneration.—P. S.]—**In the spirit.** Explanations: 1. In the *Holy Spirit* (Meyer, Fritzsche, Philippi [Hodge]). Incorrect, since the question is not yet concerning the Christian new birth. 2. In the spirit of *man* (Œcumenius, Erasmus, Beza, Reiche, and others). [Wordsworth: the inner man as opposed to the flesh.—P. S.] 3. The *Divine* spirit, as chap. vii. 6; 2 Cor. iii. 6; the spirit which fills the heart of the true Jew (Calvin, De Wette; the true spirit of the Jewish Church coming from God; Tholuck). 4. The new principle of life wrought by God in man (Rückert). 5. When πνεῦμα is placed in antithesis to γράμμα, or the life ἐν πνεύματι to the life ἐν γράμματι—that is, the life in an external, slavish, contracted pursuit of the single and outward prescriptions of the law according to the letter—then by *spirit* we are neither to understand the Spirit of God in itself, nor the spirit of man, but *the spirit* as life, the *spirit-form* of the inward life, by which the human spirit moves in the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of God in the human spirit.—**Whose praise.** Explanations of the οὗ: 1. neuter; *cujus rei* (Luther, Camerarius, Meyer: "ideal Judaism and ideal circumcision" [Wordsworth]). 2. More fitly: masculine; reference to Ἰουδαῖος (Augustine, and others, Tholuck, De Wette

* [In ver. 28 the subject is incomplete, and must be supplied from the predicate thus: οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ [Ἰουδαῖος] Ἰουδαῖος [ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ, or, ἀληθινός] ἐστιν, οὐδὲ ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ, ἐν σαρκὶ [περιτομὴ] περιτομὴ [ἀληθινή ἐστιν]. In ver. 29 the predicate is wanting, and must be inferred from ver. 28 thus: ἀλλὰ ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος [Ἰουδαῖός ἐστιν], καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας, ἐν πνεύματι, οὐ γράμματι [περιτομή ἐστιν]. This is the arrangement of Beza, E. V., De Wette, Tholuck, Alford. Dr. Lange (see *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 29) differs from this only in form, by supplying Ἰουδαῖος as predicate after ἀλλά. But Fritzsche and Meyer make ver. 29 strictly parallel with ver. 28, and take Ἰουδαῖος as predicate thus: ἀλλὰ ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ [ἐστι] Ἰουδαῖος, *but he who* [is a Jew] *inwardly is a Jew* [in the true, ideal sense of the word]. This would seem the best arrangement, if it were not for the following: καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας, &c., which Meyer renders: *and the circumcision of the heart* [is, consists in] *the spirit, not in the letter.* But a strict parallelism would here require: καὶ ἡ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ [sc. ἐστι] περιτομή. Ewald agrees with this structure of Meyer in the first clause, but would make καρδίας the predicate in the second clause: *circumcision* [is that] *of the heart.* This is forced, and would require the article before περιτομή. The sense is not materially affected by the difference of construction. In this passage the authorised E. V., upon the whole, can scarcely be improved.—P. S.]

* [Tholuck quotes from the Talmud (*Nidda*, f. 20, 2) the axiom: יְהוּדִי בְּחַדְרֵי לֵב, *Judæus in penetralibus cordis.*—P. S.]

[Alford, Hodge]). ἔπαινος, John v. 44; xii. 43. The expression, according to chap. xiii. 3 and 1 Peter ii. 14, is often "a judicial term" (Tholuck). The Apostle here declares not only that the genuine Jewish disposition of pious Jews and Gentiles is far exalted above every praise from below, and enjoys the approbation of God, but also that its honor comes from God, and will therefore be sanctioned by God by a judicial act—which can at last be nothing else but justification by faith. To Judah it was said, as the explanation of his name: "Thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise." But God Himself will praise this genuine spiritual Judah.

Second Paragraph, Chap. iii. 1–8.

Ver. 1. **What then is the advantage of the Jew** [*Τί οὖν τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου*]? After the Apostle has shown that not only the Jews are included in the same corruption with the Gentiles, but that pious Gentiles have even an advantage over ungodly Jews, he comes to the question which would naturally be presented to him—whether, then, Israel has any peculiar prerogative, and, if so, in what it consists. He does not ask in the name of a Gentile Christian (Seb. Schmid), or of the Judaist, although he must take from these every occasion for accusation, but from the standpoint of the true theocracy. The *advantage* in the sense of *profit* (De Wette).—**Or what is the benefit of circumcision** (*τίς ἡ ὠφέλεια τῆς περιτομῆς*)? The second question does not relate merely to circumcision as a single means of grace (De Wette). It makes the first question more precise, so far as for the Apostle the Jewish economy is different from the Old Testament in general (chap. iv.; Gal. iii.).

Ver. 2. **Much every way. First of all, namely.** [*πολύ* refers to both *περισσόν* and *ὠφέλεια*; Meyer. *κατὰ πάντα τρόπον*, under every moral and religious aspect, whichever way you look at it; the opposite is *κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον*.—P. S.] All that he could have in mind he shows in chap. ix. 4. But from the outset, apart from his train of thought and purpose, he had a further object than to show the advantage that to them the *λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ* were committed. We therefore accept, with Theodoret, Calvin, Bengel, and others, that *πρῶτον* means here *præcipuum*, or *primarium illud est*, *first of all*. Tholuck and Meyer [Alford, Hodge], on the other hand, suppose that he omitted to enumerate the other points (to which the *μέν* refers), and quote, as examples, chap. i. 8; 1 Cor. xi. 18.—**They were intrusted with the oracles of God.** According to our rendering of the *πρῶτον*, *τὰ λόγια* (significant promulgations, *χρησμοί*, words of revelation, Acts vii. 38; Heb. v. 12; 1 Peter iv. 11) can by no means denote the Old Testament word of God in its general aspect (Coccejus: *quidquid Deus habuit dicendum*), but this word only in the specific direction in which the most of the Jews were unbelieving in respect to it. What is meant, therefore, is not the law alone and as such (Theodoret, Œcumenius, Beza); for the law, according to Paul, was also a typical gospel (which Tholuck seems to overlook, when he says: The contents of the *λόγια* divide into the twofold part, *ὁ νόμος* and *αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι*); nor the Messianic prophecies alone (Grotius, Tholuck, Meyer), but properly both (De Wette), as one was the condition of the other, and both constituted a covenant of Jehovah with the people (Calvin, Calov [Hodge], and others). The unity of these elements lay chiefly in the patriarchal promises; and as the people of Israel were made a covenant people, these were committed to them as the oracles of God establishing the covenant, which Israel, as the servant of God, should proclaim to the nations at the proper time. [The Apostle, in calling the Old Testament Scriptures the oracles of God, clearly recognizes them as divinely inspired books. The Jewish Church was the trustee and guardian of these oracles till the coming of Christ. Now, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are committed to the guardianship of the Christian Church.—P. S.] *Ἐπιστεύθησαν*. *They were entrusted with.* *Πιστεύειν τινί τι* in the passive; comp. Winer, § 40, 1 [§ 39, 1, p. 244, 7th ed.; also Gal. ii. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 17.—P. S.] They were federally *entrusted* by the *faithfulness of God* (*πίστις*, ver. 3) with God's promises, or were *authenticated* in their *faith* in order that they might exercise it with *fidelity to faith*.

Ver. 3. **What then? If some were faithless,** &c. In these words the Apostle intimates that the Jews, in the main, still have the advantage just mentioned. The statement is therefore neither an objection nor a proof, but it *establishes* the previous point against doubt. In view of the certain fulfilment of the Divine promise, even the mass of the apostate people is only a poor crowd of individuals, *some;* though these *some* may grammatically be *many*. Meyer, taking ground against Tholuck and Philippi, disputes the contemptuous and ironical character of the expression *τινές*. The contempt and irony lies, of course, not in the word, but in the idea. Unbelief has scattered and divided Israel. According to De Wette and Fritzsche, the expression has an *alleviating* character. Since the great mass of the unbelievers was known to the readers, the expression has rather a palpable sharpness. Meyer's translation: "If many did refuse to believe (*Glaube*), their unbelief (*Unglaube*) will not annul the credibility (*Glaubhaftigkeit*) of God," expresses the correspondence of the different designations, but it is not satisfactory to the sense. The Apostle forces us, by the *πίστις Θεοῦ*, to bring into prominence here the moral force of *ἀπιστία*; and the assertion of Meyer, that *ἀπιστεῖν* and *ἀπιστία* mean always, in the New Testament, *unbelief*, not *unfaithfulness*, rests upon a false alternative.* Köllner refers the *ἀπιστία* to the unfaithfulness of the Jews in the ante-Christian time. De Wette likewise: "They have been unfaithful in keeping the covenant (Theodoret, Œcumenius, Calvin, and others); not, they have been unbelieving toward the promises and the gospel (Tholuck, Olshausen, Meyer)." This view is very strange, since he correctly observes that in the word *ἀπιστεῖν* there lie two meanings; as *πίστις* is at the same time *fidelity* and *faith*. Meyer's objection to De Wette is equally strange: "*τινές* would be altogether unsuited, for the very reason that it would not be true. *All* were disobedient and unfaithful." This is against history and the declarations of the Bible (see the discourse of Stephen, Acts vii.). If we distinguish between the ideas, *to be a sinner* and *to be an apos-*

* [Hodge: That *ἀπιστεῖν* may have the sense *to be unfaithful*, is plain from 2 Tim. ii. 13, and from the sense of *ἀπιστία*, in Heb. iii. 12, 19, and of *ἄπιστος*, in Luke xii. 46; Rev. xxi. 8. To understand the passage as referring to want of faith in Christ, seems inconsistent with the whole context.—P. S.]

tate, then it follows that, according to the Scriptures, the numerical majority of apostates was always offset by a dynamical majority of persons faithful to the covenant, by whom the covenant was continued on the ground of the πίστις Θεοῦ; and it would have been very strange if Paul, in view of this oft-repeated history, which was first really consummated in his time, should have quite ignored the present. But as ἐπίστευσαν elsewhere (for example, John viii. 30) means, they became believers, so is ἠπίστησαν here, they *have become* unbelieving, not, they *have been*. The πίστις of God is His fidelity; His fidelity to the covenant certainly involves "credibility." (2 Tim. ii. 13; πιστὸς ὁ Θεός, 1 Cor. i. 9; x. 13, &c.)

Ver. 4. **Let it not be**, μὴ γένοιτο. [Comp. *Textual Note* [4].] This expression of impassioned repulsion [solemn and intense deprecation], also common to the later Greeks, is, in the mouth of the Hebrew (חָלִילָה, *ad profana*), at the same time an expression of a religious or moral repugnance or aversion. Therefore the Apostle repels the thought, as if the τινές could annul the πίστις of God, and therefore also nullify the realization of the eternal covenant of grace in the heart of Israel and in a New Testament people of God.—**But let it be: God (is) true, but every man false.** [Lange: *So aber sei's: Gott ist wahrhaftig, jeder Mensch aber falsch.*] Since γένοιτο relates to one sentence, the antithetical γινέσθω must relate to the sentence which offsets it, and must be marked, as announcing a declaration, by a colon. According to Meyer and De Wette, it means *logice* φανερούσθω, or ἀποδεικνύσθω (Theophylact). [Tholuck prefers ὁμολογείσθω as equivalent.] But then the term would have been unfitly chosen. Koppe explains: *Much rather let it be* (*vielmehr so sei es*). Meyer objects that in this case we should expect τοῦτο or τό as article before the whole sentence, and remarks, that Paul did not design to introduce any sentence from the Old Testament. But Paul can nevertheless make use of a sentence of his own on the future of Israel, and the want of the τό does not outweigh the consideration that the γινέσθω, as the antithesis of μὴ γένοιτο, requires a formal declaration. Moreover, Ps. cxvi. 11 (all men are liars) furnished already one half, and the connection the other half of the declaration. This point was to be unfolded in all its amplitude in the history of the New Testament. See 2 Tim. ii. 13. [I prefer to connect γινέσθω (Paul does not say, ἔστω) with Θεός, and to take it in the subjective sense: *Let God become, i. e.*, be seen and acknowledged, even by His enemies, as true, whatever be the consequences. So also the E. V. and the best English commentators. The parallel, 2 Tim. ii. 13, is striking: "If we are unfaithful (ἀπιστοῦμεν), yet He abideth faithful (πιστός): He cannot deny Himself." Comp. also the phrase: *fiat justitia, pereat mundus*. —P. S.]—**God is true** [according to Dr. Lange's view, which disconnects θεός from γινέσθω]. According to Tholuck, ἀλήθεια here comprehends practical and theoretical truth; in opposition to what he denotes as the usual exposition, that the Apostle expresses the wish that God would reveal Himself continually as true and faithful (according to Coccejus, in the counsels of his plan of salvation). If the question is on the truth of God in reference to the apparent collision between the Old and New Testaments, then the sense must be that even in this powerful antithesis, which to the view of man appears to be an irreconcilable contradiction, God will remain consistent with Himself, and therefore be truthful and faithful (see 2 Cor. i. 20; Rev. iii. 14 the name Jehovah). All men are liars so far as they are sinners (sin = lie); yet unbelief is emphatically a lie (John viii. 44), since, with its rejection of the truth, it becomes obedient to falsehood, and is implicated in the grossest self-contradictions (see chap. ii. 21-23). Unbelief is not only a characteristic of apostates, but also a tendency and manifold fault of believers; and so far all men are liars through unbelief. Whenever the covenant between God and man is shaken or broken, absolute faithfulness is always found on God's side; He is a rock (Deut. xxxii. 31, &c.), while all the vibrations, as well as all the breaches of faithfulness, are on the side of men. Also, in Ps. cxvi. 11, all men are represented as liars, in opposition to the faithfulness of God; and by troubling believers they oppose faith.

As it is written (Ps. li. 4).—The application of the passage quoted from the Psalms gives evidence of the most profound insight. The original, according to Hupfeld's translation, reads thus:

"To Thee alone I have sinned,
And done what is wicked in Thy sight,
In order that Thou mayest be just in Thy sayings,
Pure * in Thy judging."

The Septuagint translates, "In order that Thou mayest be acknowledged just (δικαιωθῇς) in Thy words (in Thy sayings), and mayest conquer (νικήσῃς, instead of תִּזְכֶּה) in Thy κρίνεσθαι (בְּשָׁפְטֶךָ)." Paul quotes from the Septuagint. The sense of the original text is, that David placed himself before the judgment of God and His revelation. Viewed according to the custom of Oriental despots, Nathan had condemned him too harshly; but when he regarded his sin in all its depths as a sin against God, and before His eyes, he perceived the justice of the prophet's charge, and the holiness of his judicial declaration of the guilt of death. The translation of the Septuagint, "that Thou mayest be justified, declared just" [δικαιωθῇς for the Hebrew תִּצְדַּק], is exegetical. [In using the word δικαιοῦν here evidently, like the hiphil of צדק, in a *declaratory* sense (for God *is* just and cannot be *made* just, but only *declared* or *acknowledged* as just), Paul furnishes us the key to the proper understanding of his doctrine of justification by faith, see below, ver. 28.—P. S.] The change νικήσῃς, &c., is a periphrasis. "Thou mayest be pure in Thy judgment," means properly, "Thou wilt be recognized as pure; therefore Thou overcomest, since Thou wilt be justified in Thy judgment." The Septuagint has amplified the slight antithesis, "in Thy sayings, in Thy judgment," so that the distinction can be drawn between God's word and His judgment. The chief point is the canon: *If God is to be thoroughly known and recognized as just and holy in His word and in His judgment, then must sin, which stands committed against Him, be known in all its breadth and depth.* The defect in our knowledge here is what casts a shade in part upon God's word and in part upon His judicial government. Paul's employment of the quotation from the Psalms corresponds to this

* [צדק indicates the righteousness, זכה (properly, *to be pure*), the holiness of God.—P. S.]

canon; much sooner shall all men be liars, than that a shadow be cast on God's truth or fidelity to His covenant. The νικᾶν is frequently used in the judicial sense (see Meyer). Beza, Piscat., and recently Tholuck and Philippi [also Meyer and Ewald], would take κρίνεσθαι in the middle sense, for *to litigate*. But the Apostle could not expect that his expression would be understood in any other sense than in the Septuagint. [Comp., however, *Textual Note* [7].—P. S.]

[**That thou mayest**, ὅπως ἄν, לְמַעַן in Ps. li. 6 (ver. 4 in the E. V.), *to the intent that, in order that* (τελικῶς). This seems to mean that God caused David's sins to take this aggravated form for the very purpose that He might appear to be entirely just, when He pronounced condemnation of it. But such an interpretation would imply the contradiction that God condemns His own act. Hence most commentators (even Calvin) take לְמַעַן here, and often, like ἵνα and ὅπως in the New Testament, of the *effect* or *consequence* (ἐκβατικῶς) = *so that*. But למען and ἵνα grammatically always, or nearly always, indicate the design or purpose (see Gesen., *Thes.*, *s. v.*, and Winer, *Gramm.*, p. 426 ff., 7th ed.); and where this seems inapplicable, as here, we must assume a logical rather than a grammatical latitude. Design and effect often coincide. The Bible no doubt teaches the absolute sovereignty of God, yet never in a fatalistic or pantheistic sense so as to exclude the personal freedom and responsibility of man. Hence it represents, for instance, the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, as the judicial act and punishment of God (Exod. iv. 21; vii. 3), and at the same time as Pharaoh's own act and guilt (ix. 34). David certainly could not mean to say that he sinned with the *intention* of glorifying God—which would have destroyed the sincerity of his repentance, and exposed him to the just condemnation of Paul in ver. 8—but that his sin was overruled by God for the greater manifestation of His justice. God never does evil, nor wills any man to do evil, *in order* that good may come out of it, but He exercises His power, wisdom, and love in overruling all evil for good. It is not the sinner who glorifies God through his sin, but God who glorifies Himself through the sinner. Comp. also the remarks of Hupfeld and Hengstenberg on Ps. li. 6.—P. S.]

Ver. 5. **But if our unrighteousness, &c.** [A new objection which might be suggested by the ὅπως in ver. 4; namely, if man's sin redounds to the glory of God, and sets His righteousness in a clearer light (as in the case of David), it is a means to a good end, and hence it ought not to be punished. Paul admits the premise, but denies the conclusion, ver. 6.—P. S.] Meyer takes here ἀδικία in a very general and comprehensive sense, without regard to the legal element contained in it, and explains: "an abnormal ethical disposition." * By this definition the wicked, the unholy, the bad, can be denoted; but *unrighteousness* is misconduct in opposition to the law and the right. On συνιστάναι, see the Lexica; also Rom. v. 8; 2 Cor. vii. 11, &c. [also *Textual Note* [8]].

What shall we say? *Τί ἐροῦμεν.* A form which often occurs in Paul (chap. iv. 1; vi. 1, &c.). It is peculiar to rabbinical dialectics, and is very common in the Talmud (*quid est dicendum* *). It is a formula of meditation on a difficulty, a problem, in which there is danger of a false conclusion. It was also in use among the classics. [See Tholuck.] The sentence, *if our unrighteousness, &c.*, is true, but the following conclusion is rejected as false. The Apostle certainly assumes that an unbelieving Jew could raise this objection, but he makes it himself. This is evident, first, from the interrogative form; second, from the position of the question in such a manner that a negative answer is expected; † third, from the addition: **humanly speaking**, κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω. This expression is common among the rabbis, "as men speak" (see Tholuck); the term ἀνθρωπίνως λαλεῖν [*humane loqui*] also occurs in the classics [see the examples quoted by Tholuck]. The expression κατὰ ἄνθρ., resting on the antithesis between God and man, denotes, with Paul, now the opposition between the common sinful conduct and opinions of men, and the conduct and opinions in the light of revelation; and now the opposition between common human rights and customs and the theocratic rights (Gal. iii. 15, and other places). From this addition it does not follow that the question, μὴ ἄδικος, must be regarded as affirmative (see Meyer, against Philippi). [The phrase κατὰ ἄνθρωπον proves nothing against inspiration. The Apostle here puts himself into the place of other men, using their thoughts and arguments, but expressly rejecting them.—P. S.]

Ver. 6. **For then how shall God judge the world?** This does not mean: God would then not be able to judge the world; but, according to the usual explanation: Since it is universally agreed among religious people that God will be the Judge of the world, the conclusion alluded to must be rejected. The argument is therefore a *reductio ad absurdum*.‡ (Rückert: the proof is weak!) Coccejus [Reiche], Olshausen, and others, refer κόσμος (according to rabbinical usage of language) to the Gentile world, and the proof is thus conceived: Even Gentile idolatry must bring to light the glory of the true God; and yet God will judge the Gentile world. Therefore the unbelief of some Jews cannot escape the judgment, even though their unrighteousness corroborates the righteousness of God. But there is no proper foundation for this explanation in the text; and besides, it would only remove a smaller difficulty by a greater one, and in a way that would commend itself only to Jewish prejudice. The New Testament idea of the general judgment is universal. Even the antithesis of κόσμος and βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ cannot be applied here. With the

* [Comp. Hodge: "ἀδικία is not to be taken in the restricted sense of *injustice*, nor as equivalent to ἀπιστία in the preceding verse, but in the comprehensive sense of *unrighteousness, wickedness*. It is the opposite of δικαιοσύνη, *rectitude, righteousness*, which includes all moral excellence."—P. S.]

* [מְאי אִיכָּא לְמֵימַר.]

† [Μὴ ἄδικος ὁ θεός; in *negative* interrogations μή (μήτι, *doch nicht?*) is used when a negative, οὐ (*nonne*) when a positive answer is expected. See Winer, p. 476; Hartung, *Partik.* ii. 88; and Meyer *in loc.*; against Rückert and Philippi. Paul does not ask: Is *not* God unjust? but, Is God unjust? expecting a negative reply; and he apologises even for putting the question in this form.—P. S.]

‡ [Calvin: "*Sumit argumentum ab ipsius Dei officio quo probet id esse impossibile; judicabit Deus hunc mundum, ergo injustus esse non potest.*" So, substantially, Grotius, Tholuck, De Wette, Rückert, Köllner, Meyer, Hodge. It seems that the Apostle here assumes the very thing he is to prove. But he reasons from acknowledged premises: God is universally conceived as the Judge of all mankind; this necessarily implies that He is just. The opposite is inconsistent with the idea of God as Judge, and with the nature of the judgment.—P. S.]

usual explanation (Tholuck, Meyer, and others) it may nevertheless be asked, whether a sentence which has been dismissed with *μὴ γένοιτο*, stands in further need of a proof. According to our construction, the sentence can also be explanatory, and stand in connection with the following (see below).

Vers. 7, 8. **But if the truth of God,** &c The objection of ver. 7 appears only to repeat that of ver. 5; therefore it is difficult to connect it with what precedes. The difficulty is solved as follows: (1.) Calvin, Beza, Grotius [Bengel, Rückert], Philippi, and others think that the objection of ver. 5 is only continued and established in ver. 7; and the words *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω* to *κόσμος* (ver. 6) should be read, according to Philippi, parenthetically, as a preliminary outburst of apostolic indignation. By this means, the dialectics assume the shape of an involved controversy, in which the Apostle prematurely interrupts the opponent. Tholuck believes that he can produce similar examples in proof of this (chap. vii. 25, and Gal. iii. 3, 4). (2.) Meyer: "The *ἐπεὶ πῶς κρινεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον* (ver. 6) is now confirmed thus: The fact already considered (ver. 4 f.), that God's truth is glorified by the lie of man, removes every ground for supposing that an *unrighteous* God (*sic!*), who is to *judge* the world, will judge man as a sinner," &c. Apart from the quaint construction of the thought, the true statement in ver. 5 would be treated as untrue. [De Wette, Alford, Hodge, though differing somewhat in detail, likewise regard vers. 7 and 8 as the amplification and confirmation of the answer given in ver. 6 to the objection stated in ver. 5. If this objection be valid, then not only may every sinner claim exemption, but it would follow that it is right to do evil that good may come. This is certainly a more easy and natural connection than the one under (1.), and best explains the *γάρ*. But if we read *εἰ δέ*, we must regard ver. 7 as introducing a new objection, as in a dialogue between the Apostle and an interlocutor—an objection which is indignantly resented by Paul as a blasphemous slander. But see the remarks under the next heads.—P. S.] (3.) Even if we find here, according to Thodoret, the language of a Jew in dispute with the Apostle, the sentence does not appear to be the continuation of the thought of ver. 5. Then the Jew has first drawn the conclusion from ver. 5 that God is *unjust* if He punish sins by which He is glorified. Here he would deduce the conclusion, from ver. 4, that the man, who by his *ψεῦσμαι* contributes to the glory of God, is neither a sinner, nor punishable; rather, that he may do evil that good may come. Thus two cases, which would constitute a parallel to chap. ii. 3, 4—the first case denoting fanaticism, the other, antinomianism. But there are considerations presented by the text itself against this view. First, the *γάρ* at the beginning of ver. 7; which, for this reason, has been removed by many Codd. (B. D., &c., the Vulgate, &c.) as an impediment to the proper understanding of the passage. Then the aorist, *ἐπερίσσευσεν*, which Meyer thinks should be understood from the standpoint of the general judgment (Tholuck regards it as present, with Luther). Further, Meyer must interpolate a *τί* before the *μή* in ver. 8 (*τί μή, quidni?*). Also, if Paul be not permitted to speak in the name of the unbelieving Jew and interrupt himself, an *ἡμεῖς* must stand before *βλασφημούμεθα*. We are therefore of the opinion that the hypothesis of the interlocution of the obstinate Jew is not correct. (4.) Our explanation is contained already in the translation [See *Textual Notes* [10] and [11].] The Apostle says first, *God does not declare wrath on all who have glorified his faithfulness by their unfaithfulness.* Granted that His covenant faithfulness has, by means of my unfaithfulness, *shown itself more powerful and conspicuous* to His glory (chap. v. 8), that is, that I have finally become a believer—how? am I also still judged as a sinner? Answer: No. And therefore we would by no means continue in unbelief, as those *τινές* in ver. 3, in order, by wicked conduct, to accomplish a good purpose, God's glory—which is the principle laid by some to our charge. Men who act thus (and the *τινές* do act thus) are justly condemned. Here the *ἀλήθεια* of God is the agent, and *ψεῦσμα* is the object. In ver. 5, there was the reverse, the *ἀδικία* of man being the agent, and God's righteousness the object. In ver. 7 the question is concerning the *predominance* or conquest (see v. 20) on the side of the *ἀλήθεια* for the honor of God; in ver. 5, the question is merely concerning the bringing of the truth to light. The solution of the difficulty lies in the *ἐπερίσσευσεν*.—On the different explanations of *κἀγώ*, see Tholuck. I as well as others [De Wette, Alford]; even I, a Jew [Bengel]; even I, a Gentile [Coccej., Olshausen]; even I, Paul [Fritzsche]; even I, who have added to the glorification of God [De Wette, Tholuck].

Ver. 8. [**As we are blasphemously** (not, **slanderously**) **reported.** The blasphemy refers not only to Paul, but in the last instance to God, whose holy and righteous character is outraged by the impious maxim, to do evil that good may come.]—In reference to the *ὅτι*, we must observe that, in consequence of attraction, the *ποιήσωμεν* is united with *λέγειν*.—The *καθὼς βλασφημούμεθα* leads us to conclude that the Jews charged the Apostle, or the Christians in general, with the alleged principle: The end sanctifies the means (Tholuck, Calvin). Usual acceptation: the doctrine of superabounding mercy (chap. v. 20) is meant (see Tholuck). Meyer: "The labors of the Apostle among the Gentiles could occasion such slanders on the part of the Jews." According to the view of the Jews, the Christians converted the Gentile world to Monotheism, by betraying and corrupting the covenant of the Jews.—**Whose condemnation is just.** The *ὧν* does not refer directly to the slanderers as such, since this is an accessory notion, but to the principle, *let us do evil that good may come*, and to the fact lying at its root, *the hardness of the Jews in unfaithfulness, as they more clearly showed the covenant faithfulness of God.* But, indirectly, the charge of those slanderers is also answered at the same time. Ver. 7 favors our explanation. [*ὧν* refers to the subject in *ποιήσωμεν*, to those who speak and act according to this pernicious and blasphemous maxim.—P. S.]

Third Paragraph, vers. 9-20.

The transition of the covenant of law to the covenant of grace is already indicated in the preceding paragraph. This is brought to pass in part by the constant unfaithfulness of individuals, and in part by the transitory unfaithfulness of others. In every case Israel's sin is manifested in this covenant.

Ver. 9. **What then?** It must not be read, with Œcumenius [Koppe, Hofmann, Th. Schott], *τί οὖν προεχόμεθα* [omitting the interrogation sign

after οὖν]; against which is the οὐ. The introduction of the result refers to the foregoing section under the point of view that Israel certainly has advantages on the objective side, but none on the subjective. This is now extended further. **Προεχόμεθα.** Explanations: 1. The middle voice here has the signification of the active: Have we [the Jews] the preference? do we excel? have we an advantage? (Theophylact, Œcumenius, the old commentators in general.) Also De Wette, who says: This is the only suitable sense.* Therefore the reading προκατέχομεν. Meyer urges against this view: (*a*.) The usage of language;† (*b*) the previous admission of Israel's advantage [ver. 2, πολὺ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον, which seems to conflict with οὐ πάντως, ver. 9.—P. S.]. 2. The middle voice in the signification of: to hold before, to hold for one's protection. Hemsterhuys, Venema, &c. (Fritzsche, figuratively: Do we need a pretext?) Meyer: Have we a protection? That is, have we something with which to defend or screen ourselves? Against this, Tholuck raises the objection that the verb, in this case, should have an accusative. [Have we *any thing* for a pretext? Answer: Nothing (instead of: Not at all, not in the least).—P. S.] 3. The passive construction (Œcumenius II., Wetstein, Storr). [Œcumenius takes the word as the question of a Gentile: *Are we surpassed* by the Jews? Wetstein, as the question of a Jew: *Are we surpassed* by the Gentiles? Reiche and Olshausen: *Are we preferred* by God? This last form of the passive rendering agrees, as to sense, with the active rendering sub No. 1. But the Apostle is not speaking here of God's favor, but of man's sin, and shows that the Jews, though highly favored by God, are yet subjectively no better, and even more guilty, than the Gentiles.—P. S.] 4. The middle form was most easily applicable to the intransitive, *to be prominent, to excel;* therefore we translate, "*Are we ahead,* or, *better?*" Tholuck properly calls to mind that so many of the Greek fathers have taken no exception to the middle form. It is quite against the context when Olshausen [?] and Reiche read the word as a question of the Gentiles (shall *we* be preferred?).—**Οὐ πάντως, Not in the least.** Grotius, and others [Wetstein, Köllner], literally: *not altogether, not in all respects* [as in 1 Cor. v. 10, where πάντως limits the prohibition.—P. S.] This is contrary to the context. [For the Apostle proves the absolute equality of guilt before the law. οὐ, πάντως is here = πάντως οὐ, 1 Cor. xvi. 12; πάντως strengthens the negation, *no, in no wise; not at all;* οὐδαμῶς (Theophylact); *nequaquam* (Vulgate); *durchaus nicht; nein, ganz und gar,* i. e., *nein, in keiner Weise, keineswegs.* This sense was probably indicated by the emphatic pronunciation of πάντως, and a stop after οὐ. In 1 Cor. v. 10, on the contrary, the πάντως, *non omnino* limits the prohibition contained in οὐ. Comp. Winer, p. 516, and Meyer *in loc.*—P. S.]—**For we have before charged, προῃτιασάμεθα.** Namely, in the previous part of the Epistle [i. 18 ff., with reference to the Gentiles; ii. 1 ff., with reference to the Jews.—P. S.]. The προαιτιᾶσθαι [from αἰτία, *motive, reason,* and in a forensic sense, *charge, ground of accusation*] is a compound word without example.*—**Under sin** [ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν εἶναι]. Not merely, *are sinners* (Fritzsche). Meyer: *are governed by sin.* He denies, against Hofmann, that the question here is concerning the punishableness or guilt of sin [which is to be *inferred* afterwards from the fact of ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν εἶναι]. But this is implied in αἰτιᾶσθαι. The αἰτία is the ground of the charge

Vers. 10–19. **As it is written.** [γέγραπται occurs nineteen times in this Epistle.—P. S.] Paul had previously proved the guilt of the Jews from their living experience, with only a general allusion to the Scriptures; he now confirms his declaration in the strongest way by Scripture proofs. Under the presupposition of exact knowledge of the Old Testament, rabbinical writers also connect various testimonies without specifying the place where they may be found. At the head there stands Ps. xiv. 1–3, from ver. 10 to ver. 12, where we have a description of universal sinfulness as well of the Jews as of the Gentiles. There then follows a combination from Ps. v. 9 and cxl. 3 and Ps. x. 7, in vers. 13, 14, as a description of sins of the tongue. Then Isa. lix. 7, 8, quoted in vers. 16, 17, as a delineation of sins of commission. Finally, Ps. xxxvi. 1, in ver. 18, as a characterization of the want of the fear of God lying at the root of all.† The quotations are free recollections and applications from the Septuagint [yet with several deviations]. Finally, in ver. 19, there follows the explanation that these charges were throughout just as applicable to the Jews as to the Gentiles, and indeed chiefly to the Jews. [The passages quoted describe the moral corruption of the times of David and the prophets, but indirectly of all times, since human nature is essentially the same always and everywhere. In Ps xiv. the general application is most obvious, and hence it is quoted first.—P. S.]

Ver. 10. **There is none righteous.** [Paul uses δίκαιος for עֹשֵׂה־טוֹב, LXX.: ποιῶν χρηστότητα, *doer of good.*] Refers the ποιῶν χρηστότητα of the Septuagint to the law. *The want of righteousness* is the inscription of the whole; not as Paul's word (Köllner, &c.), but as free quotation from Ps. xiv.

Ver. 11. **There is none that understandeth.** While ὁ συνιῶν‡ represents the *receptivity* of the religious understanding, ἐκζητῶν§ denotes *the de-*

* [So also the Vulgate (*præcellimus*), Luther, Calvin, Beza, E. V., Grotius, Bengel, Tholuck, Rückert (2d ed.), Reiche, Philippi, Baur, Bloomfield, Alford, Wordsworth, Hodge, who says, with De Wette, that this is the only interpretation which suits here.—P. S.]

† [Sometimes, however, the middle and the active form of the same verb are used without a perceptible difference; as in Luke xv. 6, συγκαλεῖ τοὺς φίλους; ver. 9, συγκαλεῖται τὰς φίλας (according to Lachmann; while Tischendorf reads the active); James iv. 2 f., αἰτεῖτε and αἰτεῖσθε; Acts xvi. 16, παρεῖχε; xix. 24, παρείχετο, *præstabat.* Comp. Winer, *Gramm.*, p. 240 f., 7th ed. There is, it is true, no example of the active use of προέχομαι. But the middle voice may have been preferred here to the active, because the Apostle speaks of a superiority which the Jews claimed for themselves, *for their benefit;* comp. σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος τύπον, Titus ii. 7. This, then, comes to the interpretation of Lange, *sub* No. 4. The reading of Cod. Boerner: προκατέχομεν περισσόν, gives the same sense.—P. S.]

* [The Greek classics use προκατηγορεῖν instead; Meyer.—P. S.]

† [Meyer: 1. Sinful *condition* (vers. 10–12); 2. sinful *manifestations,* in word (13, 14), and in deed (15–17); 3. the *source* of sin (18).—P. S.]

‡ [συνίων, according to the accentuation of Lachmann or συνιών, as Alford accentuates. It is the usual form in the Septuagint for συνιείς (comp. Rom. iii. 11; Matt. xiii. 23, var.), and is derived from the obsolete root συνιέω for συνίημι. See Winer, p. 77 (§ 14, 3). It answers to the Hebrew מַשְׂכִּיל, a word often used to express the right understanding of religious truth.—P. S.]

§ [Stronger than the simple verb; comp. 1 Pet. i. 10 very frequent in the LXX.; Meyer.—P. S.]

sire and *effort* of the spirit. See the original text, where the negation is characterized as God's fruitless request. [See *Textual Note* [14].]

Ver. 12. **They are all gone out of the way** (סוּר ; נֶאֱלַח).—The ἕως ἑνός, down to one *incl.* [A Hebraism, גַּם־אֶחָד, for οὐδὲ εἷς, *not so much as one.* Comp. the Latin *ad unum omnes*, which likewise includes all.—P. S.]

Ver. 13. **An open sepulchre.** Estius [Bengel, Tholuck, Hodge]: breathing out the noxious odor of corruption. Meyer prefers the meaning: As rapacious and insatiable as a grave which awaits the corpse; in this sense, the quiver of the Chaldeans is called "an open sepulchre," Jer. v. 16—*i. e.*, destructive (also Calvin, and others). But thus ver. 15 would be anticipated.—**They have used deceit.** The imperfect ἐδολιοῦσαν* denotes continuous action; they have become deceivers for the future; that this is their settled character.—**The poison of asps.** Behind the cunning of falsehood there is deadly malice.

Ver. 14. **Full of cursing.** The gross, passionate form of ungodly speech, alternating with double-tongued, false language. The bitterness or animosity of their hateful selfishness is the standing ground of their cursing. [Paul here condenses the translation of the Septuagint, omitting the "deceit," as he had already mentioned it in ver. 13.—P. S.]

Vers. 15–17. **Their feet are swift.** The symbol of their excited course of conduct. [On the slightest provocation they commit murder. Paul here again condenses the sense of Isa. lix. 7.] Their many different ways, full of **destruction** [σύντριμμα, literally, *concussion*, *bruising together*, then *calamity*, *destruction*] and **misery** [ταλαιπωρία], (*destruction* the cause, *misery* the result) are, as the ways of war of all against all, contrasted with the one **way of peace** [ὁδὸν εἰρήνης]. By this we must undoubtedly understand not merely a way in which they should enjoy peace (Meyer), but an objective way of peace in which they should become the children of peace. [The way that leads to peace, in opposition to the ways which lead to ruin and misery.] Οὐκ ἔγνωσαν, Grotius: *Hebræis nescire aliquis dicitur, quod non curat* (Jer. iv. 22).

[Ver. 18. This quotation from Ps. xxxvi. 1 goes back to the fountain of the various sins enumerated. The fear of God, or piety, is the beginning of wisdom and the mother of virtue; the want of that fear, or impiety, is the beginning of folly and the mother of vice.—P. S.]

Ver. 19. **Now we know.** The Jews, indeed, would not readily admit this, but were inclined to refer such declarations exclusively to the Gentiles. [But the passages above quoted from the Psalms and the Prophets, speak not of heathen as heathen, but of fallen men as such, and therefore are applicable to Jews as well.—P. S.]—**The law.** This is the Old Testament, especially in its legal relation [as a norm or rule to which they should conform their faith and conduct; John x. 34, where our Lord quotes a Psalm as in "the law," and other passages].—**Who are under the law.** That is, the Jews; also particularly from the legal standpoint. Calov and others have understood, by the law, the law as distinguished from the gospel; and the expression, "those who are under the law," as meaning all men. But this is application, not explanation.—**That every mouth may be stopped.** On the question whether ἵνα may be understood ἐκβατικῶς [*so that*, instead of *in order that*], see Tholuck and Meyer. Here it evidently designates the one *purpose* of the law, to produce the knowledge of sin, but other purposes are not excluded. The φράσσειν τὸ στόμα (Ps. cvii. 42) means, in a religious relation, that it represents men as ἀναπολογήτοις at the tribunal of Divine justice; so that they "cannot answer God one of a thousand."—**The whole world.** [Not to be restricted, with Grotius: *maxima pars hominum*, but *all men*, Jews as well as Gentiles.] Paul has already declared this of the heathen portion in chap. i. 20, 32.—[**Should become** (γένηται), in their own conviction, **guilty**, subject to justice. ὑπόδικος = κατάκριτος, ἔνοχος δίκῃ, ὑποκείμενος τιμωρίαις, *i. e.*, not only *guilty*, but *convicted* of guilt, and therefore obnoxious to punishment (*straffällig*).—**Before God**, to whom satisfaction for sin is due.—P. S.]

Ver. 20.* **Because** (*Desshalb weil*). Since διότι can be *propterea quod* (*because*) as well as *propterea* (*therefore*), Tholuck [with Beza and Morus] prefers *propterea*, the conclusive form. But the Apostle here goes farther out, and comes to that universal condemnatory judgment of the law. [See *Textual Note* [20].]

By works of the law. Explanations of νόμος:

1. The *ritual* law (Theodoret, Pelagius, Cornelius a Lapide, Semler, Ammon, and others).† On the contrary, Augustine ‡ and Thomas Aquinas already referred to the concluding sentence of the verse: "by the law comes knowledge of sin." Paul, moreover, understands the word *law* throughout in its totality, although he does not ignore its several parts and differences. [The decalogue is merely the quintessence of the whole law. The antithesis is not: the ceremonial law and the moral law, but: works of the law and works of faith.—P. S.]

2. The *Mosaic* law alone [but as a *whole*, both moral and ritual] is meant (Meyer). [So also Philippi: the whole revealed law as an undivided unity, yet with special regard to the moral law.—P. S.] But against this is, that Paul speaks here, and in the

* [An Alexandrian and Hellenistic form for ἐδολίουν; see Sturz, *Dial. Alex.*, p. 61, and Winer, p. 74, where similar examples are quoted: as εἴχοσαν for εἶχον, ἐδίδοσαν for ἐδίδουν, παρελάβοσαν, ἐφάγοσαν, εἴδοσαν, &c.—P. S.]

* [On this important verse, Dr. Hodge (pp. 125–133) is very full and clear; while Alford and Wordsworth pass it over very slightly.—P. S.]

† [Several Roman Catholic and Rationalistic commentators meet from opposite extremes on Pelagian ground, and resolve the meaning of this passage simply into this: that men are not justified by any external rites or ceremonial works, such as circumcision and sacrifices, but only by moral acts of the heart and will. But the prevailing Romish doctrine is, that works of the law are works done before regeneration, which have only the merit of congruity; while the works done after regeneration, and therefore under the impulse of Divine grace, have the merit of condignity, and are the ground of acceptance with God.—P. S.]

‡ [*De spiritu et litera ad Marcellinum*, cap. 8: "*Nec audiunt quod legunt: 'quia non justificabitur ex lege omnis caro coram Deo'* (Rom. iii. 20). *Potest enim fieri coram hominibus, non autem coram illo qui cordis ipsius et intimæ voluntatis inspector est. . . . Ac ne quisquam putaret hic apostolum ex lege dixisse neminem justificari, quæ in sacramentis veteribus multa continet figurata præcepta, unde etiam ipsa est circumcisio carnis . . . continuo subjunxit quam legem dixerit, et ait: 'Per legem enim cognitio peccati'* (Rom. iii. 20)." Augustine agrees with the Reformers in the doctrine of total depravity and salvation by free grace without works, but agrees with the Roman Catholic view of the meaning of *justification*, as being a continuous process essentially identical with sanctification.—P. S.]

previous verse, of the guilt of *all* men before the law.

3. De Wette accepts it as merely the *moral* law, and not also the ritual law. The works of the law, as they were performed by the Jews, and would also have been performed by the Gentiles, if they had been placed under the law (Rückert).

4. The law in a deeper and more general sense, as it was written not only on the Decalogue, but also in the heart of the Gentiles, and embracing moral deeds of both Gentiles and Jews (Tholuck [also Storr, Flatt, Stuart]). Certainly it is plain from the context, that the Jewish νόμος here represents a universal legislation. [The Apostle includes the Gentiles as well as the Jews under the sentence of condemnation, because they do not come up to their own standard of virtue, as required by their inner law of conscience; ii. 15.—P. S.]

But what are **works** of the law [ἔργα νόμου]? Explanations:

1. Works *produced* by the law, without the impulse of the Holy Spirit [νόμου as *genetivus auctoris or causa*]. So especially Roman Catholic expositors, as Bellarmine [Augustine, Thomas Aquinas]; and also some Protestants, as Usteri, Neander, Philippi [Olshausen, Hofmann, even Luther; see Tholuck, p. 137]. Philippi: "Not the works which the law *commands* — for he who does these is *really righteous* (ii. 13)—but those which the law *effects* (or which the man who is under the law is able by its aid to bring forth)." The deeds of the law are ἔργα νεκρά (Heb. vi. 1); the νόμος cannot ζωοποιῆσαι [Gal. iii. 21], although it is complete in its method and destination. On Luther's distinction between *doing the works of the law* and *fulfilling the law itself*, see Tholuck.

2. The deeds *required* or *prescribed* by the law. Protestant expositors, *e. g.*, Gerhard, who includes also the *bona opera ratione objecti*. [So also Melanchthon, Calvin, Beza, Rückert, Fritzsche, De Wette, Meyer, Hodge. In this view, the ἔργα νόμου include all good works, those after regeneration as well as those before. Even Abraham, the friend of God, was not justified by his works, but by faith. The law of the Old Testament is holy, just, and good, and demands perfect conformity to the will of God, which is true holiness. But even our best works, done under the gospel and under the influence of Divine grace, are imperfect, and can therefore be no ground of justification. Hence the most holy men of all ages and churches never depend on their own works, but on the work and merits of Christ, for final acceptance with God.—P. S.]

3. Tholuck combines the two explanations [p. 140]: "The Apostle includes both meanings, so that, in some passages, the meaning of the deeds *required* by the law, and, in others, that of the deeds *produced* by the law, appears more prominent." But, from the very nature of the case, the deeds *required* by the law, and those *produced* by the law, correspond to each other on the *legal* standpoint. The unity of both are the works of the legal standpoint, as it may be found also among the heathen (*e. g.*, Creon in the *Antigone* of Sophocles). The law is, for *those subjected to it*, an analytical letter, which is related to the external work; but, on the contrary, for *those who seek God*, it is a synthetical symbol, which is related to the disposition of the heart. The former meaning applies certainly to every man, but only to introduce him to the understanding of its second signification. Those who know it *only* in the former meaning, always seek justification ἐκ νόμου and ἐξ ἔργου, until they are ἐξ ἐριθείας (chap. ii. 8), and only become acquainted with an apparent righteousness of a partisan character. So, on the other hand, the ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦντες, in all their efforts to fulfil the law, are more and more convinced of the impossibility of a righteousness by works. The requirement of the law, therefore, as well as its operation, continually impels—in the moral, still more in the religious sphere—by means of the knowledge of sin, far beyond the legal standpoint to faith itself. Therefore the remark frequently made: "not as if complete obedience to the law would be insufficient for justification" (Meyer), is apt to mislead.* De Wette properly remarks: "It lies in the nature of man, and of the law, that this is not fulfilled, and consequently that righteousness cannot be obtained" (see James ii. 10). Where the Old Testament Scriptures speak of righteous persons, those are meant who, in their observance of the legal letter, are theocratically and ecclesiastically irreproachable, but yet do not therein find their comfort (see Luke i. 6).

No flesh. No human being. [With an allusion to our weakness and frailty, as we say: No *mortal*. The parallel passage in Ps. cxliii. 2 has, instead: *no man living*.—P. S.] Not even the believer. It never occurs to him that he might perfect his justification by faith through dead works. [The phrase οὐ πᾶσα σάρξ is a strong Hebraism, לֹא כָּל־בָּשָׂר]

[Shall (can) be justified, δικαιωθήσεται. The future refers not to the day of judgment (Reiche), for justification takes place already in this life; nor to the indefinite, abstract future (Meyer, Philippi: whenever justification shall take place), but to the moral possibility, or impossibility rather (can ever be justified); comp. κρινεῖ, ver. 6.—P. S.]

[On the meaning of δικαιόω, *to justify*, comp. the *Exeg. Notes* on chap. i. 17; ii. 13; iii. 24. It is perfectly plain that here, and in the parallel passage, Gal. ii. 16, it can only mean, *to declare* or *judicially pronounce* just, not, to *make* just. This appears (1.) from Ps. cxliii. 2, here referred to ("*Enter not into judgment with thy servant;* for in thy sight shall no man living be justified;") (2). from the aim of the passage, which is to confirm by διότι the preceding sentence: "that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God" (ver. 19); and (3.) from the addition ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, which represents God as *Judge*, *coram Deo judice*.—Dr. Wieseler, in his exposition of the parallel passage, Gal. ii. 16 (*Commentar*, &c., pp. 176–204), enters into an elaborate discussion of the meaning of δικαιόω, of which we will give the substance in English, anticipating in part our own remarks on iii. 24:

"The verb δικαιοῦν has, in the Greek, two fundamental significations:

"(1.) τὸ δίκαιον ποιεῖν τινα (cf. κακοῦν τινα, *to do any one* κακόν, *harm*); that is, *to do any one justice*. It is used in this sense especially of a judge, and signifies, *to determine justice* generally; or more specially, according to the result of the judging, on the one hand, to *condemn* and *punish*, as with peculiar frequency in the profane writers; or also either *to declare guiltless* of the charge,

* [Meyer says this in view of the principle: οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται (ii. 13), but he immediately adds that no human being can fully comply with the law that the law only makes us more conscious of our moral imperfections.—P. S.]

or *to acknowledge*, in the case of any one, *the claims of right*, which he has; only that the favorable or unfavorable *judgment*, in this fundamental signification, is always conceived as his δίκαιον, as *deserved* by him.

"(2.) δίκαιον ποιεῖν τι, or τινά, *to make* a thing or person *righteous;* that is, either *to account* and *declare righteous*, or *to transfer into the right condition;* for the verbs in όω express also a bringing out into effect that from which the verb is derived; comp. δουλόω, τυφλόω = δοῦλον and τυφλόν ποιεῖν. So does δικαιοῦν τι accordingly signify, to *account* any thing *right* and *equitable*, to *approve, wish, require;* equivalent to ἀξιοῦν.

"The *biblical usus loquendi* of δικαιοῦν attaches itself to the Hebrew הִצְדִּיק (or צִדֵּק), of which it is commonly the translation in the LXX. This, now, for the most part signifies *to declare righteous* (judicially, or in common life); but, *to make righteous*, or, *to lead to righteousness*, only in Dan. xii. 3; Isa. liii. 11.

"Even so δικαιοῦν, in the Septuagint, frequently signifies, *to declare righteous judicially;* Ps. lxxxii. 3; Exod. xxiii. 7; Deut. xxv. 1; 1 Kings viii. 32; and in common life also, *to acknowledge as righteous*, or, *to represent as righteous;* Ezek. xvi. 51, 52; and is interchanged in this sense with ἀποφαίνειν δίκαιον; Job xxxii. 2; xxvii. 5. On the other hand, it is used with extreme infrequency in the sense, *to make righteous, to transfer into the condition of righteousness;* Ps. lxxiii. 13; Is. liii. 11; Sir. xviii. 22.

"Thus far our examination has afforded the result, that δικαιοῦν can, it is true, signify also, *to make righteous*, as well in profane Greek (in this, according to the second fundamental signification), as in the LXX., but that this signification has, in the use of the language, receded decidedly into the background in comparison with the *forensic* and *judicial*.

"To still less advantage does the signification, *to make righteous*, appear in the *New Testament* use. Leaving out of view the passages in question, where a δικαιοῦσθαι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, or διὰ πίστεως, is spoken of, there does not occur a single passage in which the signification *to make righteous* is found. (Besides the passages mentioned above, the verb occurs Matt. xi. 19; Luke vii. 29, 35; x. 29; Rom. iii. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Rev. xxii. 11.*) This fact cannot but be most unfavorable to the assumption of the signification, *to make righteous*, in the remaining passages."—P. S.]

For by the law (comes) a knowledge of sin. Tholuck would supply *only* (no more than) a knowledge; but ἐπίγνωσις is exact, living, increasing knowledge. The antithesis laid down by Chrysostom—that the law, far from being able to take away sin, only first brings it to knowledge—needs still the supplementary thought, that it is just this knowledge which is the preliminary condition for the removal of sin. [The law, being the revelation of the holy and perfect will of God, exhibits, by contrast, our own sinfulness, and awakens the desire after salvation. This sentence of Paul, together with his declaration that the law is a παιδαγωγός to lead to Christ (Gal. iii. 24, 25), contains the whole philosophy of the law, as a moral educator, and is the best and deepest thing that can be said of it. Ewald justly remarks of our passage: "*Mit diesen Worten trifft Paulus den tiefsten Kern der Sache;*" i. e. with these words Paul hits the nail on the head, and penetrates to the inmost marrow of the thing. γάρ is well explained by Calvin: "*A contrario ratiocinatur . . . quando ex eadem scatebra non prodeunt vita et mors.*"—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Chap. ii. 25–29. The elder theology has properly regarded *circumcision* as a federal sacrament of the Old Testament, and as the preliminary analogue or type of New Testament baptism; just as the Passover feast was an Old Testament type of the Lord's Supper. And thus far did the περιτομή represent the whole of Judaism, which is proved by the fact that Paul used this term to designate the Jews (see also Gal. v. 3). But it is easy to go astray on the biblical meaning of circumcision, as on the law of the Sabbath, if we do not bear in mind that we have to deal with institutions which comprehend many points of view. Thus, the Sabbatic law is first a religious and moral command of God among the Ten Commandments (Exod. xx. 8 ff.). But it is likewise a religious and liturgical, or Levitical command on worship (according to Lev. xxiii. 3). In the latter sense, it is abrogated as a mere Old Testament form, as far as Christians are concerned; or, rather, it has been supplanted by the divine-human creation of a new day "of the great congregation"—the Lord's Day. But the religious and ethical command of the Sabbath in the Decalogue has become a religious and ethical principle, which, in its educating and legal form, has connected itself with Sunday. In the same way is circumcision a synthesis. The foundation of it was a very old, sporadic, oriental custom (Epistle of Barnabas, chap. ix.*). It was made to Abraham, according to chap. iv. 11, a symbolical seal of his faith; which is certainly the sacrament of the covenant of promise. But then Moses also made it, in a more definite sense, an obligation of the law (Exod. iv. 25; Jos. v. 2 ff.). The law was the explication of circumcision, and circumcision was the concentration of the law. While, therefore, the law was annulled in regard to Christians by faith, circumcision was also annulled; or, rather, the New Testament symbol took its place, and the fulfilment of the Abrahamic promise—the new birth of faith—was connected with it. Tholuck thinks (p. 114) it is a contradiction, that, according to the elder theology,† faith in the Messiah was the condition of the Divine promise in circumcision; while, according to Paul, the fulfilment of the law was this condition. But Paul certainly knew of no other fulfilment of the law than that in the Messianic faith, which became, finally, faith in the Messiah. On p. 117, Tholuck himself refers to the inward character of the requirements of Judaism.

2. The great importance which the Apostle at-

* [If δικαιωθῇς ἐν should be the true reading, against which, see, however, Lachmann and Tischendorf.—P. S.]

* [Pseudo-Barnabas says, *l. c.*: "Thou (addressing the Jew) wilt say, 'Yea, verily the people are circumcised for a seal.' But so also is every Syrian and Arab, and all the priests of idols: are these, then, also within the bond of this covenant (or, according to the reading of Cod. Sin.: their covenant)? Yea, the Egyptians also practise circumcision."—P. S.]

† [Tholuck means "the old *Lutheran* conception of circumcision," and refers to Gerhard (*Loc. Theol.*, vol. ix., pp 12, 30), who teaches that circumcision was a sacrament of *grace*, in which the *verbale elementum* of Divine promise was connected with the material element.—P. S.]

taches to what is *within*—to the sentiment of the heart—is plain from his bold antitheses. Notwithstanding his uncircumcision, the Gentile, by virtue of his state of mind, can become a Jew, and *vice versâ*.

3. The witnesses adduced by the Apostle on the universality of corruption in Israel, neither preclude the antithesis in chap. ii. 7, 8, nor the degrees on both sides.

4. On chap. iii. 3. The *covenant* of God is always *perfect* according to its stage of development. If it generally fails to become apparent, the fault always turns out to be man's. The covenant of God is surely no *contrat social*—no agreement between equal parties. It is the free institution of God's grace. But this institution is that of a true covenant, of a personal and ethical mutual relation; and whenever the hierarchy, or a Romanizing view of the ministry obliterate the ethical obligation on the part of man in order to make the sacraments magical operations, their course leads to the desecration and weakening of the covenant acts.

5. Chap. iii. 4. For our construction of the passage in Ps. li. 4 f., see the *Exeg. Notes* on chap. iii. 4. For another view, see Philippi, p. 81, with reference to Hengstenberg, *Psalms*, vol. iii., p. 19. [Both take לְמַעַן, ὅπως, in the usual strict sense (τελικῶς, not ἐκβατικῶς), as does also Gesenius, *Thes*., p. 1052: "*eum in finem* peccavi, ut illustretur justitia tua;" and they make the old distinction between the *matter* of sin, which is man's work, and the *form* of sin, which is in the hands of God.—P. S.] Hupfeld also refers the passage to the holy interest of God's government in human offences, but at the same time has definitely distinguished the relative divine and human parts. Without contending against the thought *per se*, we would refer the ὅπως not to sin itself, but to the perception and knowledge of sin. Hence we infer the proposition: All want of a proper knowledge of sin on the part of man obscures the word of God, and leads to the misconception of His judgments (as in the talk about fanatical ideas of revelation, gloomy destiny, &c.).

6. On the *truth* of God, see the *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 4.

7. On iii. 20. By the *law* is the *knowledge of sin* (see Gal. iii. 24). This purpose of the law excludes neither its *usus primus* nor the *usus tertius*.* But the three *usus* mark the developing progress of the law from without inwardly, as well in a historical as in a psychological view. The first stage [*usus politicus*] has also its promise. The Jew who lived according to the law is justified in the tribunal of his priesthood, and has also his earthly blessing ("that it may go well with thee," &c.). But the subtilty of the law—not to speak of its first and last commandment—and its symbolical transparency and spiritualization, impel him, if he be upright, further to the pædagogical standpoint, which looks to Christ. And with this, he receives the whole power for the *tertius usus* [in regulating his life of faith].

8. While the elder theology separated the *three parts of the law* (morals, worship, polity) too far from each other, at present the idea of the law as a unit is often so strongly emphasized as to lose sight of the fact that, both in the Old Testament as well as in the New, cognizance is taken of the difference of the parts (see Matt. xix. 17; Rom. vii. 7). The view to the unity of the law, however, prevails in the Mosaic and legal understanding of the Old Testament revelation, as represented by the letters of the two tables.

9. The *incapacity of the law* to make man righteous lies chiefly in this: First, it is a demand on the work of the incapable man, who is flesh (no flesh shall be justified); but it is not a Divine promise and work for establishing a new relation. Then it meets man as a foreign will, another law; by which means his false autonomy is inclined to resistance, because he is alien to himself and to the concurring law within his inward nature. Finally, it meets him in analytical form and separateness. Man only becomes susceptible of Divine influences: 1. As they are founded in the grace and gift of God; 2. in the spontaneous action of voluntary love; 3. in synthetical concentration.

* [The old Protestant divines speak of a threefold use of the law: 1. *Usus politicus*, or *civilis* (in the state, which can only be governed by laws); 2. *usus elenchticus*, or *pædagogicus* (leading to a knowledge of sin and misery); 3. *usus didacticus*, or *normativus* (regulating the life of the believer). Comp. the *Formula Concordiæ*, p. 594 sq. Similar to this is the German sentence, that the law is *Zügel*, *Spiegel*, and *Riegel*, a restraint, a mirror, and a rule.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

(FROM CHAP. II. 25 TO CHAP. III. 20.)

Either, or. As this applied to the Jew according to his position in the Old Testament, so does it apply to the Christian according to his position in the New (ver. 25).—It is not the external possession of a saving means that produces blessings, but faithfulness in its application (vers. 25–29).—How the fact, that the Jew becomes a Gentile, and the Gentile a Jew, can be repeated in our time in various contrasts (vers. 25–27).—The Jew, proud of the letter and of circumcision, below the condemnatory sentence pronounced on the illegal and uncircumcised Gentile—a warning for evangelical Christians (ver. 27).—Inner life in religion; already the principal thing in Judaism, and much more in Christianity (vers. 28, 29).—He who is inwardly pious, receives praise, not of men, but of God.—God's pleasure or praise of inward faithfulness in piety. Herewith it must be seen: 1. How this praise can be acquired; 2. In what does it consist? (ver. 29).—The praise of men and the praise of God (ver. 29).

What advantage have the Jews? This question, and its answer, exhibit to us the infinitely great blessing of Christianity (chap. iii. 1–4).—How Paul never ignores the *historical* significance of his people, but triumphantly defends it against every charge (comp. chap. ix. 4, 5).—The historical feeling of the Apostle Paul (vers. 1–4).

On chap. iii. 2. God has shown His word to Jacob, his statutes and judgments unto Israel (Ps. cxlvii. 19). *Why* has God spoken to Israel? 1. Because He chose this people, out of voluntary compassion, for His inheritance; 2. Because by this people, specially appointed by Him for the purpose, He designed to prepare salvation for all the nations of the earth.—Do not complain too much at the unbelief of the world! For, 1. The unbelievers always remain in the minority in real significance, let their number be ever so great; 2. Not only does their unbelief not make the faith (faithfulness) of God without effect; but 3. Rather contributes thereto, by

radiantly showing God's truthfulness, in contrast with all human falsehood (vers. 3, 4).

On chap. iii. 5–8. Why is it impossible that God should have desired our unrighteousness for His glory? 1. Because *God* could not then judge the world; 2. Because *we* would be condemned as sinners by an unjust method.—How far does our unrighteousness prove the righteousness of God?—God cannot be the author of sin! This was acknowledged, 1. By Abraham, the father of all the faithful (Gen. xviii. 25); 2. By Paul, the Apostle of all the faithful.—Through God's providence, good continually comes out of evil; but we should never say, Let us do evil, that good may come!—He who says, Let us do evil, &c., 1. Blasphemes God; and therefore, 2. Receives righteous condemnation.—The principle of the Jesuits, that the end sanctifies the means, is nothing else than a hypocritical cloaking of the plain words: "Let us do evil, that good may come."

On vers. 9–18. The sinfulness of all, both Jews and Greeks: 1. Proved by Paul himself in his description of their moral depravity; 2. Corroborated by the proofs of Holy Scripture from the Psalms, Proverbs of Solomon, and the Prophet Isaiah.—As Paul appeals to the Old Testament, so should we, in order to authenticate truths, appeal to the whole Bible, though first and continually to the New Testament.—Every doctrine must be scriptural.—Paul a master in the application of Scripture: 1. So far as he grasps the fulness of the scriptural expression; but, 2. He does not thoughtlessly arrange quotations from the Scriptures; but, 3. He skilfully connects kindred passages into a beautiful whole.

On vers. 18–20. The severe preaching of the law: 1. To whom is it directed? 2. What does it accomplish?—How far does the law produce knowledge of sin?

LUTHER: Spirit is what God supernaturally effects in man; letter is all the deeds of nature without spirit (chap. ii. 29).—"God is a sure support; but he who trusts in man will want" (chap. iii. 4).—David says (Ps. li. 4): "Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned," &c. These words would seem to mean that man must sin in order that God might be just, as Paul would also seem here to say. Yet this is not the case; but we shall acknowledge the sin of which God accuses us, that He might thereby be confessed truthful and just in His law.

STARKE: A true Christian must not despise the means of grace: as, attending church, making confession, and partaking of the Lord's Supper; nor should he speak derisively of them because they are misused by most persons as a false hope (chap. ii. 25).—He who will be comforted by the consideration that he has been baptized in the name of Christ, must examine himself whether he has also been newly born, and walks after the new man: where this is not the case, holy baptism is of just as little use to him, as circumcision was to the unbelieving Jew· 1 Peter iii. 21 (chap. ii. 29).—In worldly courts, injustice often rules; but God will judge the world in the justest manner (chap. iii. 6).—When our misery is properly uncovered, compassion is near; and when we are truly compassionate ourselves, compassion is not far from us (chap. iii. 12).—The way to grace is open when we stand dumb before God (chap. iii. 19).—There is only one way to salvation, by which men, before, at the time of, and after Moses, can be saved (chap. iii. 20).—LANGE: Oh, how many Christians are put to shame at this day by honorable heathen! And how the latter will rise up against the former on the judgment-day! (chap. ii. 26).—HEDINGER: The new creature must be all in all. If this be not the case, there is no godly sorrow, no faith, no Christ, no hope of salvation (chap. ii. 25).—There is only one way to salvation, yet God is at perfect liberty to say in what people He will build His Church, and what measure of grace and gifts He will give (chap. viii. 2).—Here stands the pillar of the evangelical Church, the test and corner-stone of the pure, saving gospel (chap. iii. 20).—QUESNEL: A strong proof of original sin, because no one who comes into the world is righteous, or without sin (chap. iii. 10).—Let love be in the heart, then will loveliness be also in the mouth (chap. iii. 14).—CRAMER: Learn to distinguish well between true and false Jews, true and false Christians; the external profession does not constitute a true Jew or Christian (chap. ii. 28).—It is not all gold that glitters, and not all show is wisdom. Although the natural reason can devise many conclusive speeches and subtleties, these must not be regarded as wisdom in divine things (chap. iii. 5).—*Nova Bibl. Tüb.*: The dead members of the Church depend upon its external advantages, take their comfort in them, and make their boast of them, without remembering that they can derive no good from them without penitence and faith (chap. iii. 1).—Though we be unfaithful, God remaineth faithful. Oh, let us therefore rely upon His faithfulness and promise, and take comfort in the fact that we always have a ready entrance to the faithfulness of our God (chap. iii. 3).—OSIANDER: If God is truthful, but men false, why do some men believe folly sooner than the word of God? But to God alone belongs the praise of righteousness and truth (chap. iii. 4).—Those who boast of their righteousness before God, know neither God's will nor themselves (chap. iii. 19).

GERLACH: The usefulness of the covenant of grace extends on all sides and encompasses all the relations of life (chap. iii. 2).—God's wisdom, omnipotence, justice, and love, are glorified either in the punishment or conversion of the sinner; the more wicked the sinner, the greater the glory. But this glory consists precisely in the death of the sinner, since he either dies to sin, having once lived to it; or, with all other sinners, suffers eternal death in perdition (chap. iii. 4.).—Description of men of malignant feeling, who strive to injure others by their language. Throat, tongue, and lips—three instruments of speech, which utter the words from within (chap. iii. 13).—The more complete and deep the command, the stronger is its declaration of condemnation, and the less can it awaken in us faith and hope for salvation (chap. iii. 20).

LISCO: The Christian is aided by the sacraments only when he lives in faith (chap. ii. 25).—On what the moral worth of man before God depends (vers. 25, 26).—Israel's advantages (chap. iii. 1–4).—He who adopts the principle: "Let us sin, that good may come," will receive righteous condemnation; for God desires to be glorified only by our obedience; all disobedience is dishonoring His majesty, but terminates also with the sinner's destruction and likewise extends to the justification or glorification of the holy and righteous God (chap. iii. 8).

HEUBNER: External ecclesiasticism and confession has value only when it leads to religion of the heart and life; otherwise, it is only the same as

heathenism (chap. ii. 25).*—The great difference between outward and inward Christianity. True Christianity is internal (chap. ii. 28).—The true worshipper of God is inward, is concealed from the world, and is known only to God (chap. ii. 29).—The worth and merit of the pious person is exalted above all opinion of the world: 1. Because true piety by no means passes in the world for the highest good, but only that which is profitable, and shines; 2. Because men cannot discern this inner, pure condition of heart, neither can they credit it to others; 3. Because the world cannot reward this piety (chap. ii. 29).—God's word is committed to us; use it aright, support it, propagate it. In many places it has disappeared through the fault of men (in Asia and Africa), chap. iii. 2.—God's honor cannot be touched. Nothing can be charged against God; it would be blasphemy to charge Him with blame of any kind (chap. iii. 4).—God's righteousness becomes the more apparent in proportion to the manifestation of man's unrighteousness (chap. iii. 5).—Every feeling of hatred is the root for a willingness to shed blood (chap. iii. 15).—Every man is guilty before God, and subject to His punishment; but he should also know and confess it (chap. iii. 19).—The law requires obedience to all its commands (chap. iii. 20).

Spener: When people are wickedly taught to sin, so that God may be lauded because of the forgiveness of sins, it is the same slander which the same old slanderous devil charged at that time against the apostles, and which is still cast against the doctrine of the grace of God (chap. iii. 8).

Besser: Circumcision of the heart is real circumcision (chap. ii. 29).—The evangelical theme of joy in the Epistle to the Romans is, that God, in grace, is just in His words to sinners whom He has justified by faith in Jesus (chap. iii. 4).

Lange, on vers. 16–24. The fearful picture of warning in the fall of the Jews.—How this picture was again presented in the Church before the Reformation, and now appears in many forms.—Vers. 25–29. Comparison of this passage with Matt. xxiii. 21–28.—The great vindication here for the believer—that God, in His word, confides in him in a certain measure.—God, in His faithfulness to His covenant, a rock.—How unbelief is against God, and yet must serve God's purpose.—Chap. iii. 1–8. To have an advantage, and yet not to have one.—The testimonies of Scripture on the sinful depravity of man.—Vers. 8–19. How vain is the effort to be justified by the law: 1. Because "by the deeds of the law," &c.; 2. "For by the law," &c.

[Burkitt: (condensed) ii. 25. The heathen have abused but one talent, *the light of nature;* but we, thousands; even as many thousands as we have slighted the tenders of offered grace. What a fearful aggravation it puts upon our sin and misery! We must certainly be accountable to God at the great day, not only for all the light we have had, but for all we might have had in the gospel day; and especially for the light we have sinned under and rebelled against.—Chap. iii. 1. Great is that people's privilege and mercy who enjoy the word of God—the audible word in the Holy Scriptures, the visible word in the holy sacraments. It enlighteneth the eyes, rejoiceth the heart, quickeneth the soul. It is compared to gold for profit, to honey for sweetness, to milk for nourishing, to food for strengthening!—Chap. iii. 3–7: God is never intentionally, but is sometimes accidentally glorified by man's sins. There never was such a crime as crucifying Christ, but nothing by which God has reaped greater glory.—Chap. iii. 10. *The unrighteousness of man:* 1. There is none *originally* righteous; 2. None *efficiently* righteous; 3. none *meritoriously* righteous; 4. None *perfectly* righteous.—Matthew Henry: The Jews had the *means* of salvation, but they had not the monopoly of it.—*On the righteousness of God*, observe: 1. It is manifested; 2. It is without the law; 3. It is witnessed by the law and the prophets; 4. It is by the faith of Jesus Christ; 5. It is to all, and upon all them that believe.—Doddridge: We pity the Gentiles, and justly so; but let us take heed lest those appearances of virtue which are to be found among some of them do not condemn us, who, with the letter of the law and the gospel, and with the solemn tokens of a covenant relation to God, transgress His precepts, and violate our engagements to Him; so turning the means of goodness and happiness into the occasion of more aggravated guilt and misery.—Clarke: The law is properly considered the *rule of right;* and unless God had given some such means of discovering what sin is, the darkened heart of man could never have formed an adequate conception of it. For as an acknowledged *straight edge* is the only way in which the *straightness* or *crookedness* of a line can be determined, so the moral obliquity of human actions can only be determined by the law of God, that *rule of right* which proceeds from His own immaculate holiness.

[Hodge: When true religion declines, the disposition to lay undue stress on external rites is increased. The Jews, when they lost their spirituality, supposed that circumcision had power to save (ii. 25).—Paul does not deny, but asserts the value of circumcision. So, likewise, the Christian sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper, are of the utmost importance, and to neglect or reject them is a great sin (ii. 25; iii. 1).—It is a mark of genuine piety to be disposed always to justify God, and to condemn ourselves. On the other hand, a disposition to self-justification and the examination of our sins, however secret, is an indication of the want of a proper sense of our own unworthiness and of the Divine excellence (iii. 4, 5).—There is no better evidence against the truth of any doctrine, than that its tendency is immoral (iii. 8).—Speculative and moral truths, which are self-evident to the mind, should be regarded as authoritative, and as fixed points in all reasonings (iii. 8).—Barnes: If all men were willing to sacrifice their opinions when they appeared to impinge on the veracity of God; if they started back with instinctive shuddering at the very supposition of such a want of fidelity in Him; how soon would it put an end to the boastings of error, to the pride of philosophy, to lofty dictation in religion! No man with this feeling could be a Universalist for a moment; and none could be an infidel.

[On chap. ii. 29, see Wesley's sermon *The Cir*

* [Comp. Archbishop Tillotson, Sermon on 2 Tim. ii. 19 (quoted by James Ford on *Romans*): "Baptism *verily profiteth*, if we obey the gospel; but if we walk contrary to the precepts of it, our baptism is no baptism, and our Christianity is heathenism." We would say: *worse than* no baptism, *worse than* heathenism. For in proportion to the blessing intended, is the curse incurred by abuse. The case of an apostate Christian is far more hopeless than the case of an unconverted heathen. The one has Christianity behind him, the other before him; the one has deliberately cast it off, the other may thankfully embrace it.—P. S.]

cumcision of the Heart; on chap. iii. 1, 2, PAYSON'S sermon on *The Oracles of God;* MELVILLE'S on *The Advantages resulting from the Possession of the Scriptures;* and Canon WORDSWORTH'S *Hulsean Lecture* on *What is the Foundation of the Canon of the New Testament?* On chap. iii. 4, see DWIGHT'S sermon on *God to be Believed rather than Man;* and C. J. VAUGHAN'S on *The One Necessity.* On chap. iii. 9-19, see CHALMERS' sermon on *The Importance of Civil Government to Society.*—J. F. H.]

SIXTH SECTION.—*The revelation of God's righteousness without the law by faith in Christ for all sinners without distinction, by the representation of Christ as the Propitiator ("mercy-seat"). The righteousness of God in Christ as justifying righteousness.*

CHAPTER III. 21-26.

SEVENTH SECTION.—*The annulling of man's vain-glory (self-praise) by the law of faith. Justification by faith* WITHOUT THE DEEDS OF THE LAW. *First proof:* FROM EXPERIENCE: *God is the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews—proved by the actual faith of the Gentiles. True renewal of the law by faith.*

VERSES 27-31.

21 But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested [But now
apart from the law,[1] the righteousness of God hath been made manifest[2]], being
22 witnessed [testified to, attested] by the law and the prophets; Even[3] the right-
eousness of God *which is* by [by means of, through] faith of Jesus Christ
23 unto all and upon all[4] them that believe; for there is no difference: For all
have sinned [all sinned, *i. e.*, they are all sinners],[5] and come [fall] short [ὑστεροῦνται,
24 in the present tense] of the glory of God; Being justified freely by his grace
25 through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath [*omit* hath] set
forth [προέθετο] *to be* a propitiation [mercy-seat][6] through [the[7]] faith [,] in his
blood, to declare [for a manifestation (exhibition) of, εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικ.] his
righteousness for the remission of sins that are past [because of the prætermis-
sion (non-visitation, passing by) of the former sins, διὰ τὴν (not τῆς) πάρεσιν
(not ἄφεσιν) τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων][8] through [in, ἐν] the forbearance
26 of God; To declare, *I say*, at this time his righteousness; that he might be
just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus [with a view to the
manifestation (exhibition, πρὸς τὴν[9] ἔνδειξιν) of his righteousness at this
present time, in order that he may be (shown and seen to be) just and (yet at the same
time) be justifying him who is of the faith of (in) Jesus, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον
καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ].[10]
27 Where *is* [the] boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? [*By the*
28 *law*] of works? Nay; but by the law of faith. Therefore [For][11] we con-
clude [judge] that a man is justified by faith[12] without the deeds [without
29 works] of the law.[13] [Or, ἤ] *Is he* the God of the Jews only?[14] *is he* not also
30 of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: Seeing[15] *it is* one God, which shall
[who will] justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.
31 Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: [Far be it!] yea,
we establish[16] the law.

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 21.—[Or: *independently of the law.* Luther: *ohne Zuthun des Gesetzes.* χωρὶς νόμου, opposed to διὰ νόμου, ver. 20, is emphatically put first and belongs to the verb. The transposition in the E. V. obscures this connection and destroys the parallelism.—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 21.—[πεφανέρωται. The perfect has its appropriate force and sets forth this revelation of righteousness as an accomplished and still continued fact. Comp. the ἀποκαλύπτεται, i. 17. Meyer: "*ist offenbar gemacht, zu Tage gelegt, so dass sie jedem zur Erkenntniss sich darstellt; das Praesens der vollendeten Handlung,* Heb. ix. 26. Bernhardy, p. 378."—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 22.—[*Even* (or, *I say, inquam, und zwar*) is the best rendering of δέ here, since it is not strictly adversative, but explanatory and reassumptive (if I may coin this term for epanaleptic), as in ix. 30; Phil. ii. 8. The contrast is not between the righteousness of *God* and the righteousness of *man* (Wordsworth), but between the *general* idea of the righteousness of God and the *specific* idea of righteousness *through faith* now introduced.—P. S.]

[4] Ver. 22.—[καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας, *text. rec.*, D. F. K. L. א[3]., Syr., Vulg.; omitted by א[1]. A. B. C., Griesbach, Lach

mann. Alford brackets, and says: "Possibly from homœotel.; on the other hand, the longer text may be the junction of two readings." Lange retains the received text without remark. It is redundant, but not superfluous. Righteousness is represented as a flood extending unto all (εἰς πάντας) and over all (ἐπὶ πάντας). Ewald: "*bestimmt für alle und kommend über alle.*"—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 23.—[The aorist ἥμαρτον, not the perfect ἡμαρτήκασι. Luther: *Sie sind allzumal Sünder.* Rückert, in his ridiculously presumptuous proclivity to criticise the Apostle's grammar and logic, calls the use of the aorist here an inaccuracy. Bengel, Olshausen, and Wordsworth refer it to the original fall of the race in Adam. Meyer *in loc.*: "The sinning of each man is presented as a historical fact of the past, whereby the sinful status is brought about." So also Tholuck, Philippi, Lange. See *Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

[6] Ver. 25.—[ἱλαστήριον, *expiatorium* (a neuter noun from the adjective ἱλαστήριος, *propitiatory, expiatory*, from the verb ἱλάσκομαι, *to appease, to conciliate*), may mean *Sühnopfer* (ἱλ. θῦμα), expiatory *sacrifice*; or *Sühnmittel* (= ἱλασμός), *expiation, propitiation*; or *Sühndeckel* (ἱλ. ἐπίθεμα, or ἐπίθημα) *mercy-seat* (cover of the ark). Dr. Lange adopts the last, and translates *Sühnungsstift* (*capporeth*; Luther: *Gnadenstuhl*). The word occurs but twice in the N. T., here and Heb. ix. 5. In the latter passage it certainly signifies the mercy-seat, or golden cover of the ark of the covenant, called in Hebrew כַּפֹּרֶת (from כָּפַר, *to propitiate, to atone*). This is also the technical meaning of the word in the LXX., Ex. xxv. 18, 19, 20; xxxi. 7, &c., and in Philo (*Vita Mos.* iii. 68, p. 668; *De Profug.* 19, p. 465: τῆς δὲ ἵλεως δυνάμεως, τὸ ἐπίθεμα τῆς κιβωτοῦ, καλεῖ δέ αὐτὸ ἱλαστήριον). A fourth interpretation by Pelagius, Ambrose, Semler, and Wahl takes ἱλαστήριον in the masculine gender = ἱλαστής, *propitiator*: but this is contrary to the use of the word and inconsistent with the context. There are ἱλαστήρια, but no ἱλαστήριοι. The choice lies between *propitiatory sacrifice*, and *mercy-seat*. See *Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 25.—The article τῆς before πίστεως is supported by Codd. B. and A., Chrysostom and Theodoret. [The *text rec.* also reads τῆς; but Codd. ℵ. C*. D*. F. G. Orig., Eus., Bas., &c., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, omit it. Meyer thinks it may have been omitted in view of διὰ πίστεως, ver. 22.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 25.—[Or as Alford translates: *on account of the overlooking of the sins which had passed, in the forbearance of God.* Conybeare and Howson: *because in His forbearance God had passed over the former sins of men.* Lange: *von wegen der Vorbeilassung* (*Nichtheimsuchung*) *der vorher geschehenen Sünden.* The Authorized Version here, following Beza (*per remissionem*), is a mistranslation. πάρεσις (from παρίημι), which occurs but once in the N. T., differs from ἄφεσις (from ἀφίημι), which occurs seventeen times, in this, that it is, 1. a *temporary* prætermission or overlooking, not a *total* remission or pardon; 2. a work of the Divine ἀνοχή, *forbearance* (ii. 4), not of the Divine χάρις, grace (Eph. i. 7); 3. it leaves the question of future punishment or pardon undecided, while the ἄφεσις removes the guilt and remits the punishment. The same idea Paul expresses, Acts xvii. 30: τοὺς μὲν οὖν χρόνους τῆς ἀγνοίας ὑπεριδὼν (having overlooked) ὁ θεός, &c. διά with the accusative cannot mean *through, by means of*, or *for*, but *on account of*; for Paul clearly distinguishes (even Rom. viii. 11; Gal. iv. 13) διά with the accusative and διά with the genitive. The Vulgate correctly renders διά *propter*, but mistakes πάρεσις for ἄφεσις, *remissio*. So also Luther: *in dem dass er Sünde vergiebt.*—P. S.]

[9] Ver. 26.—τήν [before ἔνδειξιν] in Codd. A. B. C. D. [D*. ℵ. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford. The article was omitted to conform to εἰς ἔνδειξιν, ver. 25. But the article distinguishes the ἔνδειξις of ver. 26 from the former "as the fuller and ultimate object." Dr. Lange ingeniously distinguishes between εἰς ἔνδειξιν and πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν. See *Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 26.—The addition Ἰησοῦ is found in Codd. A. B. C. K. [and Sin.], Lachmann [Alford. Omitted by F. G. 52, It., Fritzsche, Meyer, Tischendorf; while other authorities read Χριστοῦ Ἰησ., or τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. A usual insertion. The force of τὸν ἐκ πίστεως is weakened by the E. V. The ἐκ indicates that πίστις, or Christ rather as apprehended by πίστις, is the root or fountain of his spiritual life; comp. the ἐκ in i. 17; ii. 18. Conybeare and Howson: "It means 'him whose essential characteristic is faith,' 'the child of faith;' comp. Gal. iii. 7, 9. δίκαιον would perhaps be better rendered by *righteous*, but we have no verb from the same root equivalent to δικαιοῦντα.—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 28.—The reading γάρ is supported by Codd. A. and Sin.; but B. C., &c., and especially the context, are in favor of the recepta οὖν. [The external authorities are decidedly in favor of γάρ. Alford regards οὖν as a correction from misunderstanding of λογίζομαι as conveying a conclusion. See *Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

[12] Ver. 28.—The reading δικαιοῦσθαι ἀνθρ. πίστει. [The *recepta* reads πίστει before δικαιοῦσθαι, to throw emphasis on faith. But ℵ[1]. B. C. D. read δικ. πίστει ἄνθρωπον.—P. S.]

[13] Ver. 28.—[χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου, without or apart from law (legal) works (*Gesetzeswerke*) or works of the law.—P. S.]

[14] Ver. 29.—Lachmann, with Codd. A. C. F. [Sin.], and many others, declare for μόνον. Tischendorf, with B. and ancient fathers, favor μόνων. [This is too poorly supported and can easily be accounted for by the preceding Ἰουδαίων.—P. S.]

[15] Ver. 30.—ἐπείπερ [*recepta*], instead of εἴπερ, which probably arose because the former occurs only here in the N. T. (see Meyer). [But εἴπερ is better supported by A. B. C. D[2]. Sin[1]., &c., and preferred by Alford.—P. S.]

[16] Ver. 31.—[ἱστῶμεν (indicative from ἱστάω, a less usual form for ἵσταμεν, from ἵστημι) is the reading of ℵ[3]. D[3] E. I. K. and Elz., and is defended by Fritzsche, for the reason that it closes the sentence with more gravity and power, and corresponds more harmoniously to the preceding καταργοῦμεν. But ἱστάνομεν (a late form of the same verb) is better supported by ℵ[1]. A. B. C. D[2]. F. Orig., &c., and is recommended by Griesbach and adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Alford. The sense is the same: *to make stand fast, to establish, to confirm*, = βεβαιοῦν, *stabilire.*—P. S.]

[Forbes arranges the important section, vers. 21–26, in this way, which may assist somewhat in the exegesis:

21. Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου
        Δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ πεφανέρωται,
    Μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν,
22.   Δικαιοσύνη δὲ Θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
            Εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας·
23.   Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν διαστολή·
            Πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον, καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ·

24. a Δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι
      b { Διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ
25.   { Ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον
    a Διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι

      b { Εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ,
        { Διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων
        { Ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ,

26.   b { Πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ
        { Ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ,

      β   Εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον
    a Καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

FIRST PARAGRAPH, CHAP. III. 21-26.

Contrast between the saving time of justification and the old time of sin and death.

Ver. 21. **But now,** *νυνὶ δέ.*—Explanations of *νυνί*: 1. Contrast of times [*at this time*, under the gospel dispensation, = *ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ*, ver. 26]; (Grotius, Tholuck, Philippi [Olshausen, Wordsworth, Hodge], and others); 2. contrast of circumstances [*as things are*]: earlier dependence on the law, now independence of the law [*διὰ νόμου—χωρὶς νόμου*], (Pareus, Piscat., Meyer, De Wette [Fritzsche, Alford. In this sense the classics use only *νῦν*, not *νυνί*, but the latter is so used repeatedly in Hellenistic Greek]); 3. in soteriology the two contrasts of time and condition coincide.—**Apart from the law** [of Moses, *χωρὶς νόμου*]: 1. It is referred to *πεφανέρωται* (Luther, Tholuck, Meyer, and others); 2. to *δικαιοσύνη* (Augustine, Wolf [Reiche, Hodge], and others): the righteousness of God which the believer shares without the law [or rather, without *works* of the law, *χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου*, Gal. ii. 16]. The latter view is not correct. [Comp. *διὰ νόμου* in ver. 20, which likewise belongs not to the noun *ἐπίγνωσις*, but to the verb to be supplied. Also *Text. Note* [1].—P. S.]

[**The righteousness of God.** Comp. the *Exeg. Notes* on chap. i. 17. It is the righteousness which proceeds from God (*gen. auctoris*), which personally appeared in Christ, "who is our Righteousness," and which is communicated to the believer for Christ's sake in the act of justification by faith. It is both *objective*, or inherent in God and realized in Christ, and *subjective*, or imparted to man. It is here characterized by a series of antitheses: independent of the law, yet authenticated by the law and the prophets (ver. 21); freely (*δωρεάν*) bestowed on the believer, yet fully paid for by the redemption price (*διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως*) of Christ (24); intrinsically holy, yet justifying the sinner (26); thus uniting the character of the moral governor of the universe, and the merciful Father who provided a free salvation.—P. S.]

Has been made manifest, *πεφανέρωται*. This is now the complete revelation of *righteousness;* as John i. 17 represents the complete revelation of *grace* and *truth;* and as Eph. i. 19 represents the complete revelation of *omnipotence.* All are single definitions of the completed New Testament revelation itself. The expression does not absolutely presuppose "the previous concealment in God's council" (Meyer).* For the Old Testament was the increasing revelation of God, also in reference to righteousness. But compared with this completeness, the growing revelation was still as a veil.—**Being testified to** [*μαρτυρουμένη*, put first with reference to *χωρὶς νόμου*, which it qualifies] **by the law and the prophets** [*i. e.*, the Old Testament Scriptures; Matt. v. 17; vii. 12; xxii. 40, &c.; just as we now say *the Bible. νόμου* has here, as Bengel remarks, a wider sense than in the preceding *χωρὶς νόμου*.—P. S.] There is therefore no contradiction between the Old and New Testaments. The Old Testament is in substance a prophetic witness of the New, and therefore also of the righteousness of faith (see chap. iv., and x. 6; Acts x. 43; chap. xv.). And not only do the prophets (Isa. xxviii. 16; Habak. ii. 4) testify to this righteousness, but so does the law also in its stricter sense (the patriarchs, &c.); yea, even its strictest sense; for example, the law of the sin-offering (Lev. xvi.). [Augustine: *Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet; Vetus T. in Novo patet.* See the proof in chap. iv. from the case of Abraham and the declarations of David.—P. S.]

Ver. 22. **Through faith of Jesus Christ.*** The usual explanation is, through faith *in* Jesus Christ [genitive of the object].† Meyer produces in its favor the usage of language (Mark xi. 22; Acts iii. 16; Gal. ii. 20; iii. 22; Eph. iii. 12, &c.), as well as the essential relation of the *πίστις* to the *δικαιοσύνη*. [These parallel passages, to which may be added Gal. ii. 16; Eph. iv. 13; Phil. iii. 9; James ii. 1; Rev. xiv. 12, seem to me conclusive in favor of the usual interpretation that OUR *faith in Christ* is meant here; comp. also *τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ*, ver. 26. But Dr. Lange strongly fortifies his new interpretation: CHRIST'S *faithfulness* TO US, taking *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* as the genitive of the subject.—P. S.] The explanation of Benecke, *the faithfulness of Christ*, is overlooked even by Tholuck. We make it, *Christ's believing faithfulness* [*Glaubenstreue*]. Reasons: 1. The *πίστις θεοῦ* (chap. iii. 3), and the coherency of the ideas, *πιστεύεσθαι, πιστεύειν,* and *πίστις θεοῦ*, in opposition to the ideas: *ἀπιστέω, ἀπιστία,* and corresponding with the ideas: righteousness of God, righteousness of Christ, righteousness by faith. 2. The addition in this passage of *εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας*; with which we must compare chap. i. 17, *ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν*. 3. The passages, Gal. iii. 22; Eph. iii. 12; comp. Heb. xii. 2. As to His knowledge, Christ of course did not walk by faith, but by sight; but as regards the moral principle of faith—confidence and faithfulness—He is the Prince of faith. 4. We cannot say of the righteousness of God, that it was first revealed by faith in Christ. The revelation of God's righteousness in the faithfulness of Christ is the ground of justifying faith, but faith is not the ground of this revelation. 5. So also the *διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι*, ver. 25, cannot be regarded as substantiating the *ἱλαστήριον*.

Unto all and upon all. The *εἰς* denotes the direction, the ideal dynamic determination of the *δικαιοσύνη*; the *ἐπί*, the fulfilment, the appropriation. [This must, of course, not be understood in a Universalistic sense. See *Textual Note* [4].—P. S.] Both prepositions have been combined in various ways as identical, and explained as strengthening the thought for *all* (thus Rückert, and others); on the contrary, Theodoret, Œcumenius, and others, have arbitrarily referred *εἰς* to the Jews, and *ἐπί* to the Gentiles; according to Morus, and others, *καὶ ἐπί*, &c., is construed as a further explanation of the *εἰς πάντας*.

For there is no difference. On account of *γάρ*, this clause refers to the former. There is

* [So also Hodge: "This righteousness which, so to speak, had long been buried under the types and indistinct utterances of the old dispensation, has now in the gospel been made clear and apparent."—P. S.]

* [*διὰ πίστεως, by means of, through;* not *διὰ πίστιν, on account of.* Faith is the appropriating organ and subjective condition, not the ground and cause of our justification.—P. S.]

† [Berlage, Scholten, V. Hengel, take Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as gen. of the author: *fides quæ auctore Jesu Christo Deo habetur.* See against this Meyer *in loc.* footnote.—P. S.]

neither a difference between Jews and Gentiles, nor, in reference to the necessity of justification, is there a difference between those who have shown themselves, according to chap. ii. 7 ff., doers or transgressors of the law.

Ver. 23. **For all sinned [they are all sinners**; Luther: *sie sind allzumal Sünder*]. They sinned, in the sense that they have become sinners. Therefore *aor.* (II.), and not *perfect*. They sinned in such a way that they are still sinning.* But their righteousness was altogether lost when their transgression began.—**And fall short of the glory** [ὑστεροῦνται, in the present tense. *All sinned*, and consequently they *come short*]. τῆς δόξης. Explanations: 1. Glorying before God, *gloriatio* † (Erasmus, Luther, Rosenmüller, and others). 2. The δόξα θεοῦ as the image of God (Flacius, Chemnitz, Rückert, Olshausen; see 1 Cor. xi. 7). 3. The glory of eternal life [as in ver. 2], (Œcumenius, Glöckler, &c., Beza, Bengel, as sharing in the glory of God). 4. Honor before God, *i. e.*, in the estimation of God (Calvin [*gloria quæ coram Deo locum habet*], Köllner). 5. The honor which God gives, *i. e.*, the approbation of God (the *genit. auct.*); Piscat., Grotius, Philippi, Meyer [Fritzsche, De Wette, Alford, Hodge]. Tholuck: The declaration of honor, like the declaration of righteousness.‡ This would give the strange sense: because they lack the declaration of righteousness on the part of God, they are to be declared righteous. It must not be overlooked that men belong here who, as inward Jews, according to chap. ii. 29, have already ἔπαινος ἐκ θεοῦ. Certainly, the question is concerning righteousness before God, because the question concerns God's judicial tribunal. But what men were wanting since Adam's fall, is not the righteousness of justification—for it is by this that that want is to be supplied—but the righteousness of life (not to be confounded with the righteousness by the works of the law), as the true glory or radiance of life [δόξα in the sense of splendor, majesty, perfection. Lange translates it: *Gerechtigkeitsglanz, Lebensruhm.*—P. S.]. But as the δικαιοσύνη of man must come from the δικαιοσύνη of God in order to avail before Him, so also the δόξα. Therefore the alternative, *from* God or *before* God, is a wrong alternative.§ But the supply is equal to the want: the δικαιοσύνη of Christ becomes the δικαιοσύνη of the believer, and therefore Christ's δόξα his δόξα (Rom. viii.).‖

Ver. 24. **Being justified freely.**¶ The participle δικαιούμενοι, in connection with what follows, specifies both the mode by which their want of Divine δόξα becomes perfectly manifest, and the opposite which comes to supply this want. The δικαιοῦσθαι does not merely come to supply the want of *glory* (according to Luther's translation: *and are justified* [Peshito, Fritzsche, = καὶ δικαιοῦνται]), but by the δικαιοῦσθαι, the fact of that ὑστεροῦσθαι becomes perfectly apparent. The individual judgment and the individual deliverance are, in fact, joined into one: repentance and faith; hunger and thirst after righteousness, and fulness.

[NOTE ON THE SCRIPTURE MEANING OF δικαιόω.—Δικαιούμενοι depends grammatically on ὑστεροῦνται, but contains in fact the main idea: *ut qui justificentur* (Beza, Tholuck, Meyer). This is the *locus classicus* of the doctrine of justification by free grace through faith in Christ, in its inseparable connection with the atonement, as its objective basis. The verb δικαιόω occurs forty times in the New Testament (twice in Matthew, five times in Luke, twice in Acts, twenty-seven times in Paul's Epistles, three times in James, once in the Apocalypse. In the Gospel and Epistles of John, as also in Peter and Jude, the verb never occurs, although they repeatedly use the noun δικαιοσύνη and the adjective δίκαιος). It must be taken here, as nearly always in the Bible, in the declaratory, *forensic* or *judicial* sense, as distinct from, though by no means opposed to, or abstractly separated from, a mere *executive* act of pardoning, and an *efficient* act of *making* just inwardly or *sanctifying*. It denotes an act of jurisdiction, the pronouncing of a sentence, not the infusion of a quality. This is the prevailing Hellenistic usage, corresponding to the Hebrew הִצְדִּיק. Comp., for the Old Testament, the Septuagint in Gen. xxxviii. 26; xliv. 16; Ex. xxiii. 7 (οὐ δικαιώσεις τὸν ἀσεβῆ); Deut. xxv. 1; 2 Sam. xv. 4; 1 Kings viii. 32; Ps. lxxxii. 3; Prov. xvii. 15; Isa. v. 23; for the New Testament, Matt. xii. 37; Luke x. 29; xvi. 15; xviii. 14 (where δεδικαιωμένος evidently refers to the publican's prayer for forgiveness of sin); Acts xiii. 39; Rom. ii. 13; iii. 4, 20, 24, 26, 28, 30; iv. 2, 5; v. 1, 9; viii. 30, 33; 1 Cor. iv. 4; vi. 11; Gal. ii. 16, 17; iii. 8, 11, 24; v. 4; Titus iii. 7; James ii. 21–25; Apoc. xxii. 11. There is, to my knowledge, no passage in the New Testament, and only two or three in the Septuagint (Ps. lxxiii. 13: ἐδικαίωσα τὴν καρδίαν μου; Isa. liii. 11: δικαιῶσαι δίκαιον; comp. Dan. xii. 3: מַצְדִּיקֵי הָרַבִּים), where δικαιόω means *to make just*, or, *to lead to righteousness*. The declarative sense is especially apparent in those passages where man is said to justify *God*, who *is* just, and cannot be *made* just, but only accounted and acknowledged as just; Luke vii. 29, 35; Matt. xi. 19; Rom. iii. 4 (from Ps. li. 5); comp. also 1 Tim. iii. 16, where Christ is said to be justified in spirit.

The declarative and forensic meaning of the phrase, δικαιοῦσθαι ἐκ πίστεως, may be proven (1.) from the opposite phrase, δικαιοῦσθαι ἐκ νόμου, which is equivalent to δικαιοῦσθαι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ἐν νόμῳ, Gal. iii. 11 (or ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, Gal. iii. 10), or ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, Rom. iii. 20; *i. e.*, to be justified in the *sight* or in the *judgment* of God; (2.) from the term λογίζειν εἰς δικαιοσύνην, *to account for righteous*, which is used in the same sense as δικαιοῦν, Rom. iv. 3, 5, 9, 23, 24; Gal. iii. 6; James ii 23, and is almost equivalent with σώζειν, *to save* (comp. Rom. v. 9, 10; x. 9, 10, 13; Eph. ii. 5 ff.) (3.) from the use of the opposite word *to condemn*.

* [Meyer: "ἥμαρτον. *Das Sündigen eines Jeden ist als historisches Factum der Vergangenheit, wodurch der sündige Zustand bewirkt ist, dargestellt. Das Perfect. würde es als vollendet dastehende Thatsache bezeichnen.*" See *Text. Note* [5], and *Exeg. Notes* on πάντες ἥμαρον in ver. 12.—P. S.]

† [This would be expressed rather by καύχησις, or καύχημα; ver. 27; iv. 2; 1 Cor. v. 6, &c.—P. S.]

‡ [Tholuck (p. 144) explains: *Die von Gott ausgehende Ehrenrettung, dem Sinne nach die Gerechterklärung*, and quotes from Schlichting: "*hoc loco significat eam gloriam, quum Deus hominem pronunciat justum.*"—P. S.]

§ [Only the honor which proceeds *from* God can stand *before* God. So far the explanations, No. 4 *coram* Deo, and No. 5 *a* Deo, amount to the same thing, as Meyer remarks. —P. S.]

‖ [Still another exposition is that of Hofmann of Erlangen (*Schriftbeweis*, vol. i. p. 632, 2d ed.): the δόξα which belongs to God, as His own attribute, like the δικαιοσύνη. Ewald: the δόξα which man had through creation, Ps. viii. 6, but which he lost through sin.—P. S.]

¶ [Wordsworth lays stress on the *present* tense, as indicating that the work of justification is ever going on by the application of the cleansing efficacy of Christ's blood to all who lay hold on Him by faith.—P. S.]

e. g., Prov. xvii. 15: "He that justifieth (מַצְדִּיק, LXX.: δίκαιον κρίνει) the wicked, and he that condemneth (מַרְשִׁיעַ) the just, even they both are abomination to the Lord," in the translation of the Vulgate: "*Qui justificat impium et qui condemnat justum, abominabilis est uterque apud Deum.*" He who would *implant* righteousness in a wicked man, or lead him into the way of righteousness, would doubtless be acceptable to God. So also Matt. xii. 37: "By thy words shalt thou be justified (*δικαιωθήσῃ*), and by thy words thou shalt be condemned (*καταδικασθήσῃ*).

The corresponding noun, *δικαίωσις* (which occurs only twice in the New Testament, viz., Rom. iv. 25; v. 18), *justification* (*Rechtfertigung*), is the opposite of *κατάκριμα*, *condemnation*; comp. Matt. xii. 37; Rom. viii. 1, 33, 34; hence the antithesis of *κρίμα εἰς δικαίωσιν* and *κρίμα εἰς κατάκριμα*, Rom. v. 16, 18. Justification implies, negatively, the remission of sins (*ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*), and, positively, the imputation of Christ's righteousness, or the adoption (*υἱοθεσία*, Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5).

No human being can so keep the law of God, which demands perfect love to Him and to our neighbor, that on the ground of his own works he could ever be declared righteous before the tribunal of a holy God. He can only be so justified *freely*, without any merit of his own, on the *objective* ground of the perfect righteousness of Christ, as apprehended, and thus made *subjective* by a living faith, or life-union with Him. This justifying grace *precedes* every truly good work on our part, but is at the same time the actual *beginning* of all good works. There is no true holiness except on the ground of the atonement and the remission of sin, and the holiness of the Christian is but a manifestation of love and gratitude for the boundless mercy of God already received and constantly experienced.

This I take to be the true evangelical or Pauline view of justification, in opposition to the interpretation of Roman Catholics and Rationalists, who, from opposite standpoints, agree in taking *δικαιόω* in the sense of *making* just, or *sanctifying*, and in regarding *good works* as a joint condition, with faith, of progressive justification. The objection that God cannot *pronounce* a man just if he is not so *in fact*, has force only against that mechanical and exclusively forensic view which resolves justification into a sort of legal fiction, or a cold, lifeless imputation, and separates it from the broader and deeper doctrine of a *life-union* of the believer with Christ. Certainly God, unlike any human judge, is absolutely true and infallible; He speaks, and it is done; His declaratory acts are creative, efficient acts. But mark, the sinner is not justified *outside* of Christ, but only *in* Christ, on the ground of His perfect sacrifice, and on condition of true *faith*, by which he actually becomes one with Christ, and a partaker of His holy life. So, when God declares him righteous, he *is* righteous *potentially*, "a new creature in Christ;" old things having passed away, and all things having become new (1 Cor. v. 7). And God, who sees the end from the beginning, sees also the full-grown fruit in the germ, and by His gracious promise assures its growth. Justifying faith is itself a work of Divine grace in us, and the fruitful source of all our good works. On the part of God, then, and in point of fact, the *actus declaratorius* can indeed not be abstractly separated from the *actus efficiens*: the same grace which justifies, does also renew, regenerate, and sanctify; faith and love, justification and sanctification, are as inseparable in the life of the Christian, as light and heat in the rays of the sun. "When God doth justify the ungodly," says Owen (on *Justification*, vol. v. p. 127, Goold's ed.), "on account of the righteousness imputed unto him, He doth at the same instant, by the power of His grace, make him *inherently* and *subjectively* righteous, or holy." Nevertheless, we must distinguish in the order of logic: Justification, like regeneration (which is the corresponding and simultaneous or preceding inner operation of the Holy Spirit), is a *single* act, sanctification a *continuous* process; they are related to each other like birth and growth; justification, moreover, depends not at all on what *man* is or has done, but on what *Christ* has done for us in our nature; and, finally, good works are no *cause* or condition, but a *consequence* and manifestation of justification. Comp. *Doctrinal and Ethical*, No. 5, below; also the *Exeg. Notes* on i. 17; ii. 13; iii. 20.—P. S.]

Freely. *δωρεάν*, as a gift, *gratis*, not by merit (chap. iv. 4; comp. 2 Thess. iii. 8). [Comp also *ἡ δωρεὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης*, Rom. v. 17, and *θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον*, Eph. ii. 3.—P. S.]—**By his grace.** The idea of grace denotes the union of God's love and righteousness, the highest manifestation of His favor, which, by its voluntary operation, as love, destroys the sinner's guilt freely, and which, as righteousness, destroys the guilt on conditions of justice. [*Grace*—*i. e.*, God's love to the *sinner*, *saving love*, is the efficient cause, *redemption* by the blood of Christ the *objective* means, *faith* the *subjective* condition, of justification. *αὐτοῦ* is emphatically put before *χάριτι*. Justification on the part of God is an act of pure grace (Eph. ii. 8–10; Gal. ii. 21), and *χάρις* is the very opposite of *μισθὸς ἔργων* or *ὀφείλημα* (iv. 4; xi. 6). Faith, on our part, is not a meritorious act, but simply the acceptance and appropriation of God's free gift, and is itself wrought in us by God's Spirit, without whom no one can call Jesus Lord (1 Cor. xii. 3).—P. S.]

Through the redemption, *ἀπολύτρωσις*. The grace of God is marked as the causality of this *ἀπολύτρωσις*. This is therefore to be regarded here as the most general view of the fact of redemption, as is also plain from the addition, *τῆς ἐν Χ. Ἰ.* [*in* Christ, not *through* Christ; comp. Eph. i. 7; *ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ*]. The *ἀπολύτρωσις*, or redemption,* in the wider sense, and viewed as a fundamental and accomplished fact, comprehends: 1. *καταλλαγή* [change from enmity to friendship, reconciliation], Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18: freedom from the enmity and rancor of sin. 2. *ἱλασμός* [propitiation, expiation], 2 Cor. v. 14; ver. 21; Gal. iii. 13 [*ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου*]; Eph. i. 7 [*τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν . . . τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων*]; Col. i. 14; Heb. ii. 17: freedom from the guilt of sin. 3. *ἀπολύτρωσις* in the narrower sense, Rom. v. 17; vi. 2; vi. 18, 22; viii. 2, 21; Gal. v. 1; Titus ii. 14; Heb. ii. 15; ver. 18: freedom from

* [Literally, *release* or *deliverance* of prisoners of war or others *from* (*ἀπό*) a state of misery or danger by the payment of a *ransom* (*λύτρον*, or *ἀντίλυτρον*) as an equivalent; the ransom in our case is the life or blood of Christ, Matt xx. 28; Eph. i. 7; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Titus ii. 14; 1 Peter i. 18; ii. 24. The synonymous verbs, *ἀγοράζειν*, 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23; *ἐξαγοράζειν*, Gal. iii. 13; *περιποιεῖσθαι*, Acts xx. 28; *λυτροῦσθαι*, Titus ii. 14, all imply the payment of a price.—P. S.

the dominion of sin. The same ἀπολύτρωσις, viewed in its ultimate aim and effect, means the transposition from the condition of the militant to the triumphant Church: Luke xxi. 28 ["the day of redemption draweth nigh"]; Rom. viii. 23; Eph. i. 7, 14; iv. 30. The ἱλασμός is justly represented here as the central saving agency of the whole ἀπολύτρωσις. [Hodge: Redemption from the *wrath* of God by the blood of Christ. Philippi, Alford, and others: deliverance from the *guilt* and *punishment* of sin by the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ. The one of course implies the other.—P. S.]

Ver. 25.* **Whom God set forth.** Explanations of προέθετο: 1. Previously purposed, designed, decreed (Chrysostom, Œcumenius, Fritzsche [Forbes], and others, with reference to Eph. i. 9); † 2. Kypke: *substituit, nostro loco dedit.* Against the meaning of προτίθημι.‡ 3. Publicly set forth (Vulgate, Luther, Beza, Bengel, De Wette, Philippi, Meyer, Tholuck [E. V., Alford, Hodge; also Delitzsch, *Comm. on Heb.*, ix. 5]). Meyer: "This signification of προτίθημι, well known from the Greek usage (Herod., iii. 148; vi. 21; Plato's *Phædr.*, p. 115, E., &c.), must be decidedly accepted, because of the correlation to εἰς ἔνδειξιν." § The peculiar interest of God is indicated by the middle voice. It was manifested through the crucifixion; compare the discourse of Jesus, in John, where He compares Himself with the serpent of Moses; John iii.‖

This explanation acquires its full weight by the following ἱλαστήριον, a substantive of neuter form, made from the adjective ἱλαστήριος, which relates to expiatory acts; see the Lexicons. In the Septuagint especially it is the designation of the mercy-seat, or the lid or cover of the ark, כַּפֹּרֶת, which was sprinkled by the high-priest with the blood of the sin-offering once a year, on the great day of atonement [and over which appeared the shekinah, or δόξα τοῦ κυρίου; Lev. xvi. 13–16; Ex. xxv. 17–22. Comp Bähr: *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus*, 1837, vol. i., p. 379 ff., 387 ff., and Lundius, *Jüd. Heiligthümer*, Hamb. 1711, p. 38 ff.—P. S.]. Besides, the settle, or lower platform [עֲזָרָה] of the altar of burnt-offering [Ezek. xliii. 14, 17, 20] was so named [because the *Asurah*, like the *Capporeth*, was to be sprinkled with the blood of atonement, or because it was the platform from which the sin-offering was offered.—P. S.]. See also Exod. xxv. 22, and other places. Explanations: 1. *Expiatory sacrifice, sin-offering* (*Sühnopfer*).* Some supply θῦμα [which, however, is unnecessary, ἱλαστήριον being used as a noun]. (So Clericus, Reiche, De Wette, Köllner, Fritzsche [Meyer, Alford, Conybeare and Howson, Jowett, Wordsworth, Hodge, Ewald]). 2. *Means of propitiation* [*Sühnmittel*] (Vulgate: *propitiatio*; Castellio: *placamentum*; Morus, Usteri, Rückert).† 3. The *mercy-seat*, or covering of the ark of the covenant [Origen, Theodoret, Theophylact, Augustine], (Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Calov., Olshausen, Philippi [Tholuck, Forbes]). Against the first exposition it may be urged: (*a.*) The expiatory offering is not brought to man on God's part, but man brings it to God by the high-priest (see Philippi).‡ (*b*). The offering is not *publicly set forth.* (*c*). The permanence of the operation of the offering requires another expression, and this is Christ crucified as the permanent atonement itself. This sets aside also the second explanation, which, moreover, is too abstract (Meyer). Arguments in favor of the third explanation: (*a.*) The *Septuagint* [uniformly] has translated כַּפֹּרֶת, ἱλαστήριον (Exod. xxv. 18, 19, 20, 21, &c. [twenty-six passages according to Fürst's Hebrew Concordance]).§ (*b.*) In Heb. ix. 5, ἱλαστήριον means the

* [Olshausen calls this verse the "Acropolis of the Christian faith." Among English commentators Wordsworth and Hodge are very full on this verse, especially the former, whose commentary is very unequal, passing by many important passages without a word of explanation, and dwelling upon others with disproportionate length. Hodge is much more symmetrical, but equally dogmatical. Of German commentators, comp. Olshausen, Tholuck, Philippi, Meyer.—P. S.]

† [Where προτίθημι is used of God's eternal purpose. In the third passage where Paul employs this verb, Rom. i. 13, he means his own purpose. The E. V. translates correctly, (*hath*) *set forth*, but suggests in the margin, *foreordained*. This interpretation would not necessarily require, as Meyer asserts, the infinitive εἶναι (*quem esse voluit Deus*), comp. προορίζειν, ἐκλέγεσθαι τινά τι, and Rom. viii. 29; James ii. 5. But it is inconsistent with the context; for Paul refers to a *fact* rather than a purpose, and emphasizes the *publicity* of the fact; comp. πεφανέρωται, ver. 21, and εἰς ἔνδειξιν, ver. 25.—P. S.]

‡ [Kypke quotes Euripides, *Iphig. Aul.*, 1592; but in this passage προὔθηκε means either simply: Diana set forth (the sacrificial animal), or she preferred. See Meyer.—P. S.]

§ [Meyer adds examples from Euripides, Thucydides, Demosthenes, and also from the LXX., and remarks, in a note, that the Greeks use προτίθεσθαι especially of the exposure of corpses to public view, and that the Apostle may have had this in mind.—P. S.]

‖ [Προτίθεσθαί τι means to set forth something as his own to others. Comp. J. Chr. K. v. Hofmann: *Der Schriftbeweis*, ii. 1, p. 337 (2d ed.): "*Nicht blos ein Interesse hat Gott dabei* (Meyer, Schmid), *sondern sein ist und von ihm kommt er, den er hinstellt, und er macht ihn zu dem, als was er ihn hinstellt.*"—P. S.]

* [This meaning of ἱλαστήριον does not occur in the LXX., but often in the later Greek writers. See the examples quoted by Meyer *in loco*, who himself adopts this explanation. Comp. also the analogous terms χαριστήριον and εὐχαριστήριον, *thank-offering*, καθάρσιον, *offering for purification*, σωτήριον, *sacrificium pro salute* (*Heilopfer*). The sense then is this: God set forth Jesus Christ, in the sight of the intelligent universe, as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world. The choice lies between this and the third view; the second having no support in the use of language, besides being too abstract. Dr. Lange has made the third interpretation (mercy-seat) more plausible than any other commentator. See below. Comp also Philippi, p. 105 f., and Forbes, p. 166, for the same view.—P. S.]

† [So also Hofmann, *l. c.*, i. 1, p. 340. He takes ἱλαστήριον to be essentially the same as ἱλασμός in 1 John iv. 10: ἀπέστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἱλασμόν. The E. V. translates both words *propitiation*. Dr. Morrison, in a monograph on Rom. iii., as I learn from Forbes (p. 166), maintains that ἱλαστήριον is never used substantively in the meaning of propitiatory sacrifice, and concludes for the adjective meaning of "set forth as *propitiatory*," which, as applied to Christ, would designate Him as the antitypical fulfilment of all the symbols of propitiation.—P. S.]

‡ [Philippi, p. 108, remarks: "The Scripture says, that Christ offered Himself to God as a propitiatory sin-offering, Heb. ix. 14, 28; Eph. v. 2; John xvii. 19, but not, that God offered and exhibited Him to mankind as a sacrifice. The sacrifice is not offered by God, but to God." But there is a difference between God *offering* His Son, and God *setting forth* His Son as a sacrifice to the contemplation of the world.—P. S.]

§ [The LXX. uses ἱλαστήριον in no other sense, except in the isolated passage, Ezek. xliii. 14, 17, 20, so that every Jewish Christian reader of the *Romans* must at once have been reminded of the *Capporeth* in the Holy of holies. Dr. Hodge, p. 143, asserts that this use of ἱλαστήριον in the LXX., arose from a mistake of the Hebrew term, which means a cover, and never the mercy-seat. (So also Gesenius, Fritzsche, De Wette, and Bleek, *Comm. on Heb.* ix. 5, vol. iii., p. 499, note *b.*) But כַּפֹּרֶת is not derived from the unusual *Kal* of the verb כָּפַר (*to cover*, Gen. vi. 14), but from the *Piel* כִּפֵּר, which always means, *to forgive*, *to propitiate*, *to atone* (Lev. xvi. 33; Deut. xxxii. 43; Ezek. xliii. 20, 26, &c.), and is the technical term, in the Mosaic

mercy-seat. (*c*.) This view is sustained by the idea pervading the whole Epistle, of the contrast between the old worship, which was partly heathen and partly only symbolical, and the real New Testament worship. The verb προέθετο [*ad spectandum proponere*] likewise favors it.* As, according to John i. 14, the δόξα, or Shekinah, openly appeared in the person of Christ from the secrecy of the Holy of holies, and has dwelt among men, so, according to the present passage, is the ἱλαστήριον set forth from the Holy of holies into the publicity of the whole world for believers. See Zech. xiii. 1; the open fountain. (*d*.) The ἱλαστήριον unites as symbol the different elements of the atonement. As the covering of the ark of the covenant itself, it is the throne of the divine government of the cherubim above, and the preservation of the law, with its requirements, below. But with the sprinkled blood of expiation, it is a sacrifice offered to God, and therefore the satisfaction for the demands of the divine law below. Also Philo called the covering of the ark of the covenant the symbol of the gracious majesty [ἵλεω δυνάμεως] of God [*Vit. Mos.*, p. 668; comp. Josephus, *Antiq.* iii. 6, 5.—P. S.].

Meyer [admits that this interpretation agrees with the usage of the word, especially in the LXX., and gives good sense by representing Christ as the antitypical *Capporeth*, or mercy-seat; but, nevertheless, he] urges against it the following objections: † (*a*.) That ἱλαστήριον is without the article. But this would exclude the antitype, the Old Testament ἱλαστήριον. The requisite articulation is here in ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. [With more reason we might miss ἀληθινόν or ἡμῶν. Christ may be called OUR *pascha*, or the TRUE *pascha*, or the TRUE *mercy-seat*, rather than simply *pascha* or *mercy-seat*. Yet this is by no means conclusive.—P. S.] (*b*.) The name, in its application to Christ, is too abrupt. Answer: Since there must be a place of expiation for every expiatory offering, the conceptions of places and offerings of expiation must have been quite familiar to the readers, not merely to the Jews, but also to the Gentiles, although here the idea is connected with the Old Testament symbol. (*c*.) If Christ should be conceived as *Capporeth*, then the εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ would be improper, since the *Capporeth* must much rather appear as ἔνδειξις of divine *grace*. This objection rests simply on a defective understanding of the Pauline idea of righteousness (see above). According to Paul, righteousness is not merely condemnatory and putting to death, but, in its perfect revelation, also delivering and quickening. Grace itself is called, on one side, righteousness, on the other, love. (*d*.) The conception of Christ as the antitype of the mercy-seat nowhere returns in the whole New Testament. Answer: Likewise the types of Christ as the antitype of the brazen serpent (John iii. 14), and Christ as the curse-offering (Gal. iii. 13), and others, only occur once. (*e*.) It has also been objected [but not by Meyer], that the image does not suit, because the covering of the ark and the sprinkling of the blood were two different things. [Hodge: "It is common to speak of the blood of a sacrifice, but not of the blood of the mercy-seat."] In reply to this, even Meyer observes: Christ is both sacrifice and high-priest.—On the ignorantly contemptuous manner in which Rückert and Fritzsche criticise the proper explanation, see Tholuck. [Fritzsche dismisses this interpretation with a frivolous "*valeat absurda explicatio*."—P. S.]

Through faith in his blood [διὰ πίστεως, ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι]. Different interpretations: 1. By faith on His blood (ἐν instead of εἰς; Luther, Calvin, Beza, Olshausen [Tholuck, Hodge], and others). Although the language will permit this view, the thought is not only obscure, but incorrect, that God, by faith on the blood of Christ, should have made Christ himself the throne of grace for humanity. Faith, in this sense, is a *consequens*, but not an *antecedens*, of the established propitiation. 2. The same objection holds good against the construction of Meyer, and others, by which both clauses, διὰ τῆς πίστ. and ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, should refer coördinately to προέθετο; namely, so that faith would be the subjective condition, and the blood of Christ the objective means of the setting forth of Christ as the expiatory offering.* An objective condition should precede the subjective one, and the propitiation exists before faith, in the sense of the New Testament idea of salvation. Faith is therefore the completed *faithfulness* of Christ (see ver. 22), which, in the blood of His sacrificial death, has become the eternal spiritual manifestation and power for the world. [As in ver. 22, I beg leave here to differ from this unusual interpretation of πίστις, and understand this, with other commentators, more naturally of *our* faith *in* Christ; comp. τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ at the close of ver. 26. If it meant the *faithfulness of Christ*, the Apostle would probably have added αὐτοῦ, as he did before αἵματι. It is better to separate the two classes by a comma after "faith."—The blood of Christ means His holy life offered to God as an expiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world. It is like a healing fountain send-

ritual, for the object and intent of sacrifice. If the word were formed from the *Kal*, it would be כְּפֹרֶת. "The golden lid was called כַּפֹּרֶת, not because it covered the open ark, but because it subserved the act of expiation which was here performed" (Bähr, *Symbolik des Mos. Cultus*, i., p. 381). The *Capporeth* was the centre of the presence and revelation of God, and His glory dwelt over it between the two cherubim which overshadowed the ark, and represented the creation. Hence the Holy of holies was called בֵּית הַכַּפֹּרֶת (1 Chron. xxviii. 11). The Peshito and Vulgate (*propitiatorium*) have followed the LXX. Comp. also Tholuck, *Rom.*, 5th ed., p. 157, note; and Ewald, *Alterth.*, p. 165. But Ewald and Meyer derive כַּפֹּרֶת from כפר in the sense of *scabere, to rub off, to forgive*; against which Tholuck protests in favor of the usual derivation from כִּפֵּר. Ewald (*l. c.*, p. 165, 3d ed. of 1866) maintains that *Capporeth* cannot mean the plain cover, as if the ark had no other, but a second cover or a separate settle (the footstool of Jehovah), which was even more important than the ark itself, and is so described, Ezek. xxv. 17-21; xxvi. 34, &c. He derives it from כפר, as *scamnum*, or *scabellum* from *scabere*, and refers to כֶּבֶשׁ, 2 Chron. ix. 18, and to an Ethiopic verb.—P. S.]

* [Wordsworth, on the contrary, urges προέθετο as an argument against this interpretation, since the mercy-seat was not set forth, but concealed from the people and even from the priests. But this has no force.—P. S.]

† [Repeated by Jowett *in loc.*—P. S.]

* [Meyer, in the third and fourth editions, connects διὰ τῆς πίστεως with ἱλαστήριον, and ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι only with προέθετο: God set forth Christ in His blood (*i. e.*, by causing Him to shed His blood, in which lies the power of the atonement) as a sin-offering, which is effective through faith. De Wette connects both διὰ πίστ. and ἐν τῷ αὐτ. αἱμ. alike with ὃν προέθετο ἱλαστήριον, the former expressing the means of the subjective appropriation (*das subjective Aneignungsmittel*), the latter the means of the objective exhibition (*das objective Darstellungsmittel*) of Christ as a propitiatory sacrifice. So also Alford who seems to follow De Wette (at least in the *Romans*) more than any other commentator.—P. S.]

[bri]ng forth streams through the channel of faith to wash away the guilty stains of sin.—P. S.]

For the demonstration of his righteousness [εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ]. In order to perfectly reveal and establish it. The divergent interpretations of the word δικαιοσύνη indicate how difficult it has been for theology to regard God's righteousness as grace which produces righteousness. Truthfulness [contrary to the meaning of δικαιοσύνη], (Ambrose, Beza [Turretin, Hammond], and others); goodness (Theodoret, Grotius [Koppe, Reiche, Tittmann], and others); holiness (Neander, Fritzsche [Lipsius]); judicial righteousness (Meyer* [De Wette, Tholuck, Philippi, Alford, Wordsworth, Hodge]); justifying, or sin-forgiving righteousness (Chrysostom, Augustine, and others); the righteousness which God gives [which would be a superfluous repetition of ver. 21, and inconsistent with ver. 26,] (Luther, and others); [Stuart, and others: God's method of justification, which δικαιοσύνη never means.—P. S.]. It is rather *the righteousness of God in the fulness of its revelation*, as it proceeds from God, requires and accomplishes through Christ the expiation of the law, and institutes the righteousness of faith by justification as the principle of the righteousness of the new life.† For the righteousness of God, like His truth, omnipotence, and love, forms an unbroken and direct beam from His heart, until it appears in renewed humanity.

Because of (or, on account of) the pretermission (passing over), [*i. e.*, because He had allowed the sins of the race which were committed before Christ's death to pass by unpunished, whereby His righteousness was obscured, and hence the need of a demonstration or manifestation in the atoning sacrifice, that fully justified the demands of righteousness, and at the same time effected a complete remission of sins, and justification of the sinner.—P. S.]. The πάρεσις must not be confounded with the ἄφεσις, as Cocceius has proved in a special treatise, *De utilitate distinctionis inter πάρεσιν et ἄφεσιν* (Opp. t. vii.). [Comp. *Textual Note* [8].] The judicial government of God was not administered in the ante-Christian period, either by the sacrificial fire of the Israelitish theocracy, or by the manifestations of wrath to the old world, both Jews and Gentiles, as a perfect and general judgment. Notwithstanding all the relative punishments and propitiations, God allowed sin, in its full measure, especially in its inward character, to pass unpunished in the preliminary stages of expiation and judgment, until the day of the completed revelation of His righteousness. For this reason, the time of the πάρεσις is denoted as the time of the ἀνοχή. God permitted the Gentiles to walk in their own ways (Ps. lxxxi. 12; cxlvii. 20; Acts xiv. 16); He overlooked, or winked at, the times of this ignorance (Acts xvii. 30). But among the Jews, one of the two goats which was let loose in the wilderness on the great day of atonement, represented symbolically the πάρεσις (Lev. xvi. 10). This is not only a transcendent fact, but one that is also immanent in the world. The fact that the administrators of the theocracy, in connection with the Gentile world, have crucified Christ, proves the inability of the theocracy to afford a fundamental relief of the world from guilt.*—**Of sins previously committed.** The sins of the whole world are meant, but as an aggregate of individual sins; because righteousness does not punish sin until it has become manifest and mature in actual individual sins. [Comp. the similar expression, Heb. ix. 15: εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων. This parallel passage, as well as the words ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, in ver. 26, plainly show that the προγεγονότα ἁμαρτήματα are not the sins of each man which precede his conversion (Calov., Mehring, and others), but the sins of all men before the advent, or, more correctly speaking, before the atoning death of Christ. Comp. also Acts xv. 30: τοὺς χρόνους τῆς ἀγνοίας ὑπεριδὼν ὁ θεός. Philippi confines the expression to the sins of the Jewish people, in strict conformity to Heb. ix. 15; but here the Apostle had just proven the universal sinfulness and guilt, and now speaks of the universal redemption of Christ.—P. S.]

Vers. 25, 26. **Under the forbearance of God for the demonstration** [*Unter der Geduld Gottes zu der Erweisung*, ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ, &c.]. Construction: 1. Œcumenius, Luther [Rückert, Ewald, Hodge], and others, refer the ἀνοχή to προγεγονότων [*i. e.*, committed *during* the forbearance of God; comp. Acts xvii. 20. This gives good sense, but would require, as Meyer says, a different position of the words, viz., τῶν ἁμαρτ. τῶν προγεγον. ἐν τῇ ἀν. τ. θ.—P. S.]. 2. Meyer refers the forbearance to πάρεσις, *in consequence* of indulgence or toleration, as the ground of the passing over. [So also Philippi]. 3. Reiche: εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης; the δικαιοσ. having been manifested partly in the forgiveness of sins, and

* [Meyer, p. 146 (4th ed.): "In the strict sense, the *judicial* (more particularly the *punitive*) *righteousness*, which demanded a holy satisfaction, and secured it in the atoning sacrifice of Christ." De Wette (and, after him, Alford): "This idea alone suits the δικαιοῦν, which is likewise judicial. A sin-offering excites, on the one hand, the feeling of guilt, and is expiation; on the other, it produces pardon and peace; and thus Christ's death is not only a proof of God's grace, but also of His judicial righteousness, which requires punishment and expiation (2 Cor. v. 21). Here is a foundation for the Anselmic theory of satisfaction, but not for its grossly anthropopathic execution."—P. S.]

† [Forbes, p. 168: "God's judicial righteousness in both its aspects, of sin-condemning and sin-forgiving righteousness."—P. S.]

* [Dr. Hodge, from fear of Romanizing inferences, takes πάρεσις in the sense of ἄφεσις, and adopts the false translation of the Vulgate *propter remissionem*, "because God had overlooked or pardoned sin from the beginning." . . . "To say God did not punish sins under the Old Dispensation, is only a different way of saying that He pardoned them. So, 'not to impute iniquity,' is the negative statement of justification." Comp. against this, *Textual Note* [8]. Hodge goes on to say (p. 150): "This passage is one of the few which the Romanists quote in support of their doctrine that there was no real pardon, justification, or salvation before the advent of Christ. The ancient believers, at death, according to their doctrine, did not pass into heaven, but into the *limbus patrum*, where they continued in a semi-conscious state until Christ's *descensus ad inferos* for their deliverance. The modern transcendental theologians of Germany, who approach Romanism in so many other points [?], agree with the Papists also here. Thus Olshausen says, 'Under the Old Testament there was no real, but only a symbolical forgiveness of sins.' Our Lord, however, speaks of Abraham as in heaven; and the Psalms are filled with petitions and thanksgiving for God's pardoning mercy." But how will Dr. Hodge on his theory explain the Old Testament doctrine of Sheol or Hades before Christ's resurrection, and such passages as Heb. ix. 15; xi. 39, 40; Acts xiii. 39, which likewise plainly teach the incompleteness of the Old Testament salvation before the advent of Christ? There certainly can be no remission of sin without the sacrifice of Christ; and whatever remission there was under the Old Dispensation, was granted and enjoyed only by reason of the retrospective efficacy, and in trustful anticipation of that sacrifice. But anticipation falls far short of the actual reality. Tholuck calls the atonement of Christ not unaptly "the Divine theodicy for the past history of the world."—P. S.]

partly in the delay of punishment. [This implies a wrong view of διά and δικαιοσ.; Meyer.—P. S.] 4. We connect the ἀνοχή with the following πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν (ver. 26) into one idea,* and suppose here a brief form of expression, by which προγεγονότων must be again supplied before ἀνοχή. The πάρεσις must by all means be connected with the ἀνοχή; but it is not operative by virtue of this alone. The ἀνοχή denotes the old time as the period of God's prevailing forbearance, to the end that He may reveal His perfect righteousness in the future decisive time. The πάρεσις, on the contrary, appeared at that time as the supplement of the propitiatory and retributive judgments which had already commenced as preliminaries. For this reason, the εἰς ἔνδειξιν (ver. 25) is not the same as πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν (ver. 26). The first ἔνδειξις, as the judicial righteousness revealing itself in the blood of Christ, has supplemented the πάρεσις. The second ἔνδειξις is the purpose of the ἀνοχή, the fully accomplished ἔνδειξις, which branches off in penal righteousness, and in justifying righteousness to him who "is of the faith of Jesus, and draws faith from His fountain of faith." The εἰς should therefore not be confounded with the πρός (Meyer).†

Ver. 26. **[At this present time,** ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, not opposed to ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ (Bengel, Hodge), but rather to πρό in προγεγονότων, and added emphatically. The time of Christ is a time of critical decision, when the πάρεσις is at an end, and man must either accept the full remission (ἄφεσις) of sin, or expose himself to the judgment of a righteous God.—P. S.]—**That He may be just and the justifier,** &c. [εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ. The εἰς expresses not merely the result, but the design of God in exhibiting Christ to the world as the mercy-seat.—P. S.] We emphasize αὐτόν, *one and the same* (*ein und derselbe*).‡ That He may *be*—that is, that He may plainly appear [and be recognized by men in this twofold character as the Just One and the Justifier of the sinner]. The righteousness of God in the death of Christ has fully revealed that which the human view of the early and later times found so difficult to grasp; namely, righteousness and forbearance or love in one spirit, condemnation and deliverance in one act, killing and giving new life in one operation.

[Bengel: "*Summum hic habetur paradoxon evangelicum; nam in lege conspicitur Deus justus et condemnans, in evangelio justus ipse et justificans peccatorem.*" This apparent contradiction is solved, objectively, in the love of God, which is the beginning and the end of his ways; and, subjectively, in faith (τὸν ἐκ πίστεως), by which the sinner becomes one with Christ. In the death of Christ, God punished sin and saved the sinner, and Divine justice was vindicated in the fullest display and triumph of redeeming love. Not that the Father poured the vials of His wrath upon His innocent and beloved Son (as the doctrine is sometimes caricatured), but the Son voluntarily, in infinite love, and by the eternal counsel and with the consent of the holy and merciful Father, assumed the whole curse of sin, and, as the representative head of the human family, in its stead and for its benefit, He fully satisfied the demands of Divine justice by His perfect, active and passive obedience. His sacrifice, as the sacrifice of the eternal Son of God in union with human nature, without sin is of infinite value both as to extent and duration while the Old Testament sacrifices were merely anticipatory, preparatory, and temporary. Justification is here represented as the immediate effect of Christ's atoning death. On δικαιόω, comp. the *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 24, and also *Doctrinal*, below, No. 5. Wordsworth has a long note here on the doctrine of justification. He likewise maintains that δικαιόω (and הִצְדִּיק) in the LXX. and in the New Testament means, not to *make* righteous, but to *account* and *declare* righteous, and to *regard* and *treat* as such, in opposition to *condemning* and *pronouncing guilty*. But he insists also, that we are actually *made* righteous by our *union* with Christ, and that God's righteousness is not only *imputed*, but also *imparted* to us in Him who is "the Lord our Righteousness." This work of infusion of grace, however, is not properly called *justification*, but *sanctification*. Comp. vi. 22: "*Being freed from sin*, and made servants unto God—*i. e.*, being *justified*—ye have your fruit unto *holiness*"—this is *sanctification*.—P. S.]

SECOND PARAGRAPH (VERS. 27-31).

Ver. 27. **Where, then, is the boasting?** This announces the great conclusion from the foregoing. The lively expression of the paragraph arises from the triumphant confidence of the Apostle. [Bengel: ποῦ, *particula victoriosa*.] The καύχησις [*gloriatio*] is certainly not the same as καύχημα [*gloriandi materia*], subject of boasting (Reiche); but yet it is not exactly *bragging* (Meyer), since in many persons boasting of the law arose from dogmatic error. Jewish boasting is especially meant here,* but not exclusively, for the general conclusion is here drawn in reference to the righteousness of the Jews and Gentiles (see ver. 19). With the negation of the καύχησις, the καύχημα is also denied at the same time.—**It is excluded.** Perhaps the expression is here chosen with reference to the limits of the court of justice. The law excludes unqualified plaintiffs and defendants.—**By what law? (By the law) of works?** Since the Mosaic law was a law of works in form only, and not in spirit (see chap. vii. 7), the question presupposes that there is no such law of works; the spirit of the law is the law of faith. But the meaning of the question itself is: the law, as such, erroneously made a mere law of works, is too imperfectly developed in its operation to exclude boasting (see

* [Hence Dr. Lange, in his translation, makes a period after ἁμαρτημάτων. I prefer the construction of Meyer and Philippi as being more natural. The ἀνοχή must not be confounded with χάρις: the former suspends and puts off the judgment by πάρεσις, the latter abolishes the guilt of sin by ἄφεσις.—P. S.]

† [Meyer: "πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν, *Wiederaufnahme des* εἰς ἔνδειξιν, ver. 25, *und zwar ohne* δέ, ver. 22, *wobei* εἰς *mit dem gleichbedeutenden* πρός *absichtslos vertauscht ist, der Artikel aber der Vorstellung der bestimmten, geschichtlich gegebenen* ἔνδειξις *dient, was dem Fortschritte der Darstellung entspricht.*" So also Tholuck and Philippi. The latter commentator explains the exchange of πρός for εἰς from euphony, to avoid the threefold repetition of εἰς (εἰς ἐνδ., ver. 25; εἰς τὸ εἶναι, ver. 26).—P. S.]

‡ [Meyer takes αὐτός simply as the pronoun of the third person. It evidently belongs both to δίκαιον and δικαιοῦντα.—P. S.]

* [Hence the article ἡ, which seems to refer to the καύχησις already spoken of in chap. ii. 17; iii. 19, comp. below, ver. 29. So Chrysostom, Theodoret (τὸ ὑψηλὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων φρόνημα), Bengel, Rückert, Tholuck, Philippi, Meyer, Alford; while Fritzsche, Hodge, and others, take it in a general sense of the boasting of the *sinner* before God; which, of course, includes the boasting of the Jews over the Gentiles.—P. S.]

Matt. xix. 20.—**By the law of faith.** According to Meyer, the Apostle speaks of the law of faith because the gospel prescribes faith as the condition of salvation. According to Tholuck and De Wette, the word νόμος has here the idea of a religious rule (*norma*).* But, according to ver. 31, the Apostle will completely establish the same law, for the making void of which the Jew charged him. The same revealed law which, in its analytical character—that is, in its single commandments—bears the appearance of a law of single works, is, in its synthetical character, recognized as one, a law of faith (Deut. vi. 4, 5; Mark xii. 29; James ii. 10); because, as our schoolmaster to lead us to Christ, it leads to faith, and in Him first comes to man as the objective principle of faith, and then, as the subjective principle of faith, it becomes the law of the new life. [With νόμος πίστεως, comp. ὑπακοὴ πίστεως, i. 5; νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς, viii. 2; ἔννομος Χριστοῦ, 1 Cor. ix. 21; νόμος τέλειος τῆς ἐλευθερίας, James i. 25; ii. 12—all going to show that the liberty of the gospel has nothing to do with license and antinomianism.—P. S.]

Ver. 28. **Therefore [For] we judge.** λογιζόμεθα [*censemus*, comp. ii. 3; viii. 18; 2 Cor. xi. 5], is not, we *infer*, nor merely, we *think*, *reckon* (Tholuck [Alford, Hodge]), which, with the reading γάρ, would not even make good sense. The expression, "*For we think*," would be an odd method of demonstration. It is not the subjective fact of justification which establishes the objective economy of salvation already described; but it is this objective economy which, on the one hand, excludes false justification, namely, that which is by works; and, on the other hand, establishes real justification, that which is by faith. We must consider also that the Apostle lays down the statement of ver. 28 as the principal proposition to the entire following argument, but will not apply it as proof for the negative statement, that man is not justified by works.—**By faith** [πίστει = διὰ πίστεως, instrumental cause]. Luther's addition of *alone* [*durch den Glauben* ALLEIN] is defended by Tholuck (the Nuremberg edition of the Bible of 1483 also reads, *only* by faith). Meyer properly remarks: It does not belong to the translation, but it is justified by the context as an explanation.†—**Without works of the law.** This naturally refers to δικαιοῦσθαι, but not to faith. In the process of *justification*, the works of the law do not come into coöperation. [**Hodge:** "To be justified without works, is to be justified without any thing in ourselves to merit justification. The works of the law must be the works of the moral law, because the proposition is general, embracing Gentiles as well as Jews. . . . The Apostle excludes every thing subjective. He places the ground of justification out of ourselves." Yet faith is something subjective, by which the objective ground of justification is personally appropriated, and made available for our benefit.—P. S.]

Ver. 29. **Or is he the God of the Jews only?** [*Or*, in case that what was said in ver. 28 should be called in doubt. Vers. 29, 30 furnish an additional striking proof for ver. 28; Meyer.—P. S.] εἶναι τινος, *to belong to some one.* The Rabbinical, and subsequently the Talmudic Jews, certainly assumed that God was merely the God of the Jews (see Tholuck, p. 162. Meyer refers to Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judenthum*, i. p. 587).—Paul can declare, without further proof: **Yes, of the Gentiles also.** The Apostle does not have here in mind chiefly the utterances of the prophets, as Tholuck supposes, but the same fact of Christian experience to which Peter refers, Acts x. 46 ff.; xv. 9; and to which he himself refers in Gal. iii. 5. The Old Testament witnesses were explained and confirmed by the fact of the salvation of the Gentiles by faith, by which fact also his apostleship to the Gentiles was first completely sealed (see 1 Cor. ix. 2). [God is not a national, but a universal God, and offers salvation to Gentiles and Jews on precisely the same terms. Hodge: "These sublime truths are so familiar to our minds, that they have, in a measure, lost their power; but as to the Jew, enthralled all his life in his narrow national and religious prejudices, they must have expanded his whole soul with unwonted emotions of wonder, gratitude, and joy."—P. S.]

Ver. 30. **Seeing it is one God.** The ἐπείπερ, *since* [*alldieweil*, introducing something that cannot be doubted]. According to Meyer, the weight

* [So also Alford and Hodge: "νόμος is not used here in its ordinary sense. The general idea, however, of a *rule of action* is retained."—P. S.]

† [This is very true. Luther's *allein* is correct in substance, and appropriate as a gloss or in a paraphrase, but has no business in the text. It is a logical inference from the context, and is equivalent to the ἐὰν μή in the parallel passage, Gal. ii. 16. The Latin Vulgate had taken the same liberty, it is true, in other cases; and, in this very verse, Luther's insertion can be justified by Catholic versions, viz., the oldest German Catholic Bible of Nuremberg (published 1483, the year of Luther's birth), which reads: NUR *durch den Gl.*, and two Italian versions (of Genoa, 1476, and Venice, 1538, *per la* SOLA *fede*). Even Erasmus defended Luther in this case, and said: "*Vox* SOLA *tot clamoribus lapidata hoc sæculo in Luthero, reverenter in Patribus* [!] *auditur.*" Comp. Wolf, Koppe, Tholuck, and Philippi *in loco.* Nevertheless, the insertion of the "*sola*" in the translation was unnecessary and unwise, and, in the eyes of Romanists, it gave some plausibility to the unjust charge of falsifying the Scriptures. It brought Paul into direct verbal (though no real) conflict with James, when he says that by "works man is justified, and *not by faith only*" (οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον, ii. 24). The dogmatic formula, *sola fide* (hence the term *solifidianism*), has become a watchword of evangelical Protestantism, and, rightly understood—*i. e.*, in the sense of *gratia sola*—it expresses a most precious truth, which can never be sacrificed. But it must not be confounded with *fide solitaria*, a faith that *is* and *remains* alone. The χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου must be connected with the verb, not with πίστει. The Bible never says: "faith justifies," but, "we are justified by faith (πίστει)," because faith comes into view here simply as a means, or as the ὄργανον ληπτικόν which apprehends and appropriates Christ; and hence it is by faith, without the coöperation of works, that we are justified. But faith is nevertheless the fruitful source of all good works. "*Fides sola justificat, at nec est, nec manet sola: intrinsecus operatur et extrinsecus.*" The more full and correct formula would be: *Gratia sola justificamur per fidem quæ Christi justitiam apprehendit et per caritatem operatur* (πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη), or salvation by grace alone as apprehended by a living faith. Justifying faith purifies the heart, overcomes the world, and abounds in fruits of righteousness. It is impossible truly to believe in Christ, without partaking of the power of His holy life. Wordsworth *in loc.* hits the point, when he says: "Though it is by faith we are justified, and by faith *only*, yet not by such a faith as has no works springing out of it. Every such faith is a dead faith. And yet it is not from the works that spring out of faith, but from the faith which is the root of works, that all are justified." In other words, it is not by faith as an active or working, but by faith as a receptive or appropriating principle, by which we are justified; yet that which faith receives is a power of life which must at once manifest itself in good works. It is but just to Luther to add, that he taught most clearly and forcibly this inseparable connection between faith and works. I shall quote but one passage from his admirable preface to the Epistle to the Romans: "*O es ist ein lebendig, geschäftig, thätig, mächtig Ding um den Glauben, dass es unmöglich ist, dass er nicht ohne Unterlass sollte Gutes wirken. Er fragt auch nicht, ob gute Werke zu thun sind, sondern ehe man fragt, hat er sie gethan, und ist immer im Thun. . . . Also dass unmöglich ist, Werke vom Glauben zu scheiden; ja, so unmöglich, als brennen und leuchten vom Feuer mag geschieden werden.*" Comp. p. 140. No. 9.—P. S.]

of the proof rests on the unity of God, Monotheism; but the context puts the weight upon the fact that the justification of the Jews and Gentiles as *one* divine fact—which therefore appears to be divided into two parts—must be traced to one and the same God.—The future δικαιώσει is certainly not used for the present δικαιοῖ (Grotius [*more Hebræorum*], and others), still less does it refer to the universal judgment (Beza, Fritzsche); but it assumes the experience that Jews and Gentiles are already justified, in order to give prominence to the future established by it; namely, that Jews and Gentiles will be justified. [The future (= *præsens futurabile*) expresses the permanent purpose and continued power of justification in every case that may occur; comp. the future in ver. 20 and v. 19. Erasmus: "*Respexit ad eos qui adhuc essent in Judaismo seu paganismo.*"—P. S.]—**Circumcision by faith.** It is remarkable that there is not only a change of the prepositions ἐκ and διά, but also that the article stands with the latter, but not with the former. Meyer regards the change of prepositions, as well as the disappearance of the article from ἐκ, as a matter of indifference.* Calvin observes in the change of the prepositions ἐκ and διά a certain irony: "*Si quis vult habere differentiam gentilis a Judæo, hanc habeat, quod ille* PER *fidem, hic vero* EX *fide justitiam consequitur*" (from Tholuck, p. 162). Meyer properly regards this explanation as strange. But indifference as to the form of expression would be equally strange. There seems in reality to be a double form of breviloquence here: He will justify the circumcision (which is a circumcision by faith) *by* faith; for the real Jew *has already a germinating faith;* and He will justify the uncircumcision (that which through faith has become circumcision) *through* the faith. Or, more briefly: To the genuine Jew, saving faith, as to its germ, is something already at hand, and justification arises from the completion of the same, just as the fruit from the tree. But to the Gentile, faith is offered as a foreign means of salvation.†

Ver. 31. **Do we then make void the law?** The question here arises, whether ver. 31 constitutes the conclusion of the preceding train of thought, or whether it opens the new train of thought which begins with chap. iv. 1, and extends throughout the chapter. The former acceptation has prevailed since Augustine as the preferable one (Beza, Melanchthon, Tholuck, Philippi [Hodge]); the latter (conformably to Theodoret, Pelagius) has been maintained by Semler, and others, and by De Wette and Meyer. According to Meyer, the Apostle, from chap. iii. 31 to iv. 25, proves the harmony of the doctrine of justification by faith with the law, by what has been said in the law about Abraham's justification. Meyer urges against the former view, that then this very important sentence appears merely as an abrupt categorical assertion; and Philippi's reply, that chap. viii. 1 continues it further, certainly does not relieve the matter. But Tholuck justly remarks against the second view, that then a γάρ, instead of οὖν, would be naturally expected in chap. iv. 1. [Besides, the main object of Paul here is to show the true method of justification, and not the agreement of the law and the gospel.—P. S.] This much is clear: that ver. 31 constitutes the transition to chap. iv. But, in itself, it serves as the conclusion of the paragraph from vers. 27–30, in that it brings out the relation of the experimental fact that there are believing Gentiles—to the law. Paul had shown that the justification of the Gentiles, with the justification of the Jews, is to be traced back to one and the same God. By this means, he says, the law is not made void, but established. How far established? The answer is furnished by the preceding verses: As far as the unity of God, which underlies the law, is glorified by the harmony of His saving operations among Jews and Gentiles. Particularism weakens the law, because it makes the law the statute of a national God. The universal Monotheism of Christianity, proved by the universal justification of believers, first properly establishes the law in its true character, by making plain the universal character of the lawgiver.—The sentiment, Do we then make void the law? is sufficiently repelled by the emotional expression, μὴ γένοιτο, **Far be it! by no means!** But the opposite sentiment, **We establish the law,** has been already proved by the fact that the law is defined as the law of faith, and has been traced back to the God of the Jews and Gentiles. This is indeed extended further in what follows, yet not in the form of a continued proof, but in the form of a new scriptural argument. The question, How far does Paul, or Christianity establish the law? has been variously answered; see Tholuck, p. 163. Chrysostom, and others, say, that the salvation in Christ is the end of the law. Most expositors hold that the law is fulfilled by the new obedience, chap. vi. and viii. 4 [by love, which is called "the fulfilment of the law;" xiii. 10. Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Calov., Philippi.—P. S.]. Tholuck thinks that the testimony of the νόμος and the προφῆται is meant. But this is not a new ἱστάναι; nor would the continuation in chap. iv. be a new ἱστάναι from this point of view; it is only a new proof for the righteousness by faith: the proof from Scripture. The Apostle glorifies and establishes the law on a new and broader foundation, by representing it as a unit, by tracing it to its principle of life, and enlarging its contents from the Jewish particularism to the universality of the revelation of the living God of all men. Thus the Mosaic law, as the type of the Mosaic religion, is glorified so far as it is the representative of all the legal elements of religion in general.*

* [So also Hodge, since Paul uses both forms indiscriminately; ἐκ, in i. 17; iii. 20; iv. 16; and διά, in iii. 22, 25; Gal. ii. 16, and sometimes first the one and then the other, in the same connection. Comp. the English prepositions *by* and *through*. According to De Wette and Alford, ἐκ πίστεως, *by faith*, expresses the objective *ground;* διὰ τῆς πίστεως, *through his* (*their*) *faith*, the subjective *medium* of justification. Jowett connects ἐκ πίστεως with περιτομήν, *the circumcision which is by faith*, and thereby destroys the correspondence to the other member. Green (*Gr.*, p. 300, as quoted by Alford) refers διὰ τῆς πίστεως to πίστεως just mentioned, *by the instrumentality of the identical faith which operates in the case of the circumcised.* Bengel: "*Judæi pridem in fide fuerant; gentiles fidem ab illis recens nacti erant.*"—P. S.]

† [Very similar is the interpretation of Wordsworth: The Jews, or children of Abraham, are justified *out of* or *from* (ἐκ) the faith which Abraham their father had, and which they are supposed to have in him, being already in the covenant with God in Christ. The Gentiles, οἱ ἔξω, must enter that door of the faith of Abraham, and pass *through* it (διά), in order to be justified. There is but one Church from the beginning. Abraham and his seed are *in* the household of faith in Christ, but they must live and act *from* its spirit; the heathen must *enter* the house *through* the door of that faith in Him.—P. S.]

* [Comp. a long note of Wordsworth *in loc.*, who assigns no less than twelve reasons for the assertion of ver. 21, viz., because the doctrine of justification is grounded on the testimony of the law that all are under sin; because the sacrifice of Christ was pre-announced by the passover, and other sacri

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

First Paragraph (vers. 21-26).

1. As the Old Testament, according to ver. 21, has testified of the righteousness of faith contained in the New Testament, so does the New Testament —as the perfect revelation of God's righteousness— bear witness to the holiness of the law in the Old Testament.

2. It is a defective and inorganic view to believe that, as far as the single attributes of God are concerned, in the New Testament His justice is less prominent than in the Old, in order that His love may appear more prominent. On the contrary, the revelation of His justice is first completed in the New Testament. It is here completed so grandly, that, in proportion to this completion, the Old Testament revelation of justice may be regarded as still veiled. The same may be said of all the Divine attributes. In the New Testament they have a killing and a vivifying—*i. e.*, creative effect. The justice in union with love is grace. In the Old Testament, however, justice appears mainly in its punitive aspect.

3. On the double form and kind of faith, see the *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 22.

4. Also on the δόξα θεοῦ, see *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 23. As the δικαιοσύνη is the internal part of the Divine δόξα, so is the want of δόξα on man's part the evidence of his want of δικαιοσύνη. The same connection is likewise exhibited in the life of faith. The δοξάζεσθαι arises from the δικαιοῦσθαι (chap. viii. 30).

5. The doctrine of *justification*. On the δικαιοῦν, see chap. ii. 13, and the section relating thereto. On the fact that it is under the δικαιοῦσθαι that man's utter want of personal righteousness first becomes prominent, see the *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 21. The evangelical definition *per fidem* is opposed to the Roman Catholic definition *propter fidem*. The form *propter fidem* has a double sense. If faith is understood as merit, the order of the work of salvation is reversed, and its causality is transferred to man. It is very clear from the present tense δικαιοῦσθαι (ver. 28), that the Apostle distinguishes here, and throughout, between *redemption* and *justification*. Christ is, indeed, effectively the righteousness of believers, and virtually the righteousness of humanity, and so far could the redemption be once loosely denominated justification. Yet the Apostle's usage of language is far above this indefiniteness, and chap. viii. 30 proves conclusively (comp. chap. v. 18) that he regards justification as a part of the plan of salvation. The connection between the δικαίωσις—which grace effects in every believer after the κλῆσις—and the ἱλασμός, consists in this: that Christ, as the perfect δικαίωμα, is, by the gospel, offered to men, that He is set forth as ἱλαστήριον. (Lipsius, in a monograph entitled *The Pauline Doctrine of Justification*, 1853, holds that the δικαιοσύνη is the condition of righteousness, and that every one is δίκαιος who is just what his destination requires he should be. The author's conclusion is, that Paul, in no single passage, compels us to divide the divine operation—the result of which is the (preliminary) human δικαιοσύνη—into two distinct and separate acts, the *actus efficiens* and the *actus declaratorius*, in such a manner that the latter only may be called δικαιοῦν.)—The way for the Protestant doctrine of justification was prepared by the sound productions of the mysticism of the Middle Ages; for example, in "German Theology." * This book contrasts selfdom, or egoism, with entire self-surrender to God and His will, and thereby indicates the deepest ground for the sinner's justification by faith. Justification, as the appropriation of Christ's δικαίωμα, makes the gospel, through the power of the Holy Ghost, an individual and special absolution from the guilt of sin, which the believer experiences in peace of conscience and freedom. It makes the objective δικαίωμα in Christ his subjective δικαιοσύνη. Justification is essentially a pronouncing righteous, but by the creative declaration of God; therefore it is also a making righteous, in the sense that it is the communication of a new principle of life, yet in such a way that this new principle of life must ever be regarded as the pure effect of Christ, and not in any way as the *cause* of justification. The one gracious act of justification is divided into two acts: 1. The offer of the δικαίωμα for faith until faith is awaked by free grace; 2. Accounting faith as righteousness. The effects of justification are, negatively, liberation from the guilt, the curse, and punishment of sin; and, positively, adoption or sonship, by which the believer's filial relation—that is, the decision of his individual regeneration, and his translation into the state of peace —is pronounced. In the old Protestant theology, justification has been variously confounded too much with the redemption itself; while in our day, as was already the case with Osiander [died 1552], it has often been far too much identified with sanctification.

[Additional remarks on the doctrine of *justification by faith*, or rather *by free grace through faith in Christ*.

(*a*.) Its *importance* and *position* in the theological system. It belongs to soteriology, the appropriation of the salvation of Christ to the sinner. It presupposes the fundamental truths of the Trinity, the incarnation, total depravity, the atonement, all of which were revealed before, as the Gospels and Acts precede the Epistles. It is therefore not, strictly speaking, the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiæ* (Luther), but subordinate to the article of *Christ*, who alone can be called the one foundation and rock of the whole Christian system (1 Cor. iii. 11). The doctrine that

fices of the law; because the law reveals God as a just Judge, who needs an adequate propitiation for sin; because the death of Christ is such a propitiation; because Christ has, by His perfect obedience to the law, established its dignity; because justification by faith obliges men to new degrees of love and gratitude to God, &c., &c. But these are all subordinate points.—In one sense the law is abolished, as a type and shadow of things to come; as a killing letter, with its curse; comp. Eph. ii. 25; Gal. iii. 13; but as to its moral contents, as the expression of the holy will of God, as a rule of conduct, it was perfectly fulfilled by Christ, and is constantly fulfilled by every believer in love to God and love to our neighbor. The decalogue is a national code in *form*, a universal code in *spirit* and *aim*. This applies to all the Ten Commandments, from which we cannot take out one (say the second, or the fourth) without marring the beauty, harmony, and completeness of the whole. Christ has settled that question in His interpretation of the law, by the fundamental principle of the magna charta of the kingdom of heaven, as laid down Matt. v. 17 ff.—P. S.]

* [The *Deutsche Theologie*, or *Theologia Germanica*, is the work of an unknown author of the fifteenth century and was edited by Dr. Luther with a highly commendatory preface in 1516, one year before the commencement of the Reformation. Recent editions by Pfeiffer, 1855, and Reifenrath, 1863. There is also an English translation by Susanna Winkworth, with introductions by Bunsen and Kingsley, London, 1855, reprinted at Andover, 1856.—P. S.]

Christ is the Son of God, and came into the flesh—*i. e.*, was born, died, and rose again, to save sinners—is emphatically "the mystery of godliness" (1 Tim. iii. 16), and forms the burden of the first Christian confession (Matt. xvi. 16–19); its assertion or denial is the criterion of true Christianity and of antichrist (1 John iv. 2, 3). But justification by faith is undoubtedly a fundamental article of *subjective* Christianity and of evangelical Protestantism, as distinct from œcumenical Catholicism, and as opposed to Greek and Roman sectional Catholicism. It constitutes the material or life-principle of Protestantism (*principium essendi*), as the doctrine of the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures in matters of faith and practice constitutes its *formal* principle (*principium cognoscendi*). It was never properly understood in the Christian Church, not even by Augustine, until Luther, and the other Reformers brought it out into clear light from the Epistles of Paul, especially those to the Romans and Galatians. The unbiassed philological exegesis of modern times has fully justified the scripturalness of this doctrine of the Reformation. Yet the best men in the Church of all ages, and the profoundest divines before the Reformation, such as Augustine, Anselm, Bernard, have, in fact, always come to the same practical conclusion in the end, and, disclaiming all merit of their own, they have taken refuge in the free grace of God, as the only and sufficient cause of salvation. "Our righteousness," says St. Bernard (*Sermo V. de verbis Esaiæ Proph.*, vi. 1, 2), "our righteousness, if we have any, is of little value; it is sincere, perhaps, but not pure, unless we believe ourselves to be better than our fathers, who no less truly than humbly said: All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags."

(*b.*) *Definition* of justification. It is a judicial act of God by which He freely acquits the penitent sinner, and adopts him as His child on the ground of Christ's perfect righteousness, and on condition of a living faith. Paul has in his mind a judicial process: The righteous and holy God is the Judge; man is the guilty culprit; the law, or the expressed will of God, is the accuser; Christ, with His perfect sacrifice, steps in as a substitute; the sinner accepts Him in hearty faith, or enters into Christ's position, as Christ did into his; God, on the ground of this relation, acquits the sinner, and treats him as His own child; the sinner, being one with Christ, no more lives unto himself, but, the grace of God enabling him, unto Christ, who died for him, and rose again. This is justification.

(*c.*) Relation to the *atonement*, *regeneration*, and *sanctification*. Justification differs:

(*aa.*) From the *atonement* (ἱλασμός, ἱλαστήριον, *expiation*, *propitiation*, *Versühnung*) and the consequent *reconciliation* (καταλλαγή, *at-one-ment* in the *old* sense of the term, as used in the E. V., Rom. v. 11, in German *Versöhnung*), *i. e.*, the reconciliation of God and the sinner by the self-sacrifice of Christ, which fully satisfies the claims of Divine justice, and draws men to God by the attraction of superhuman love. The atonement is the objective ground of justification; it was accomplished once for all time, but justification is repeated in the case of every sinner.

(*bb.*) From *regeneration*, or the new birth. This is a creative act of the Holy Spirit in man preceding or accompanying the objective act of justification by God the Father, and resulting in a subjective change of heart, which corresponds to the new relation of the believer as justified in Christ.

(*cc.*) From *sanctification*. This is a gradual growth, beginning with regeneration and justification, and culminating in the resurrection of the body. Justification is God's gracious act *toward* us; sanctification is God's gracious work *within* us: the former is a single act of God, the latter a continuous growth in man.

(*d.*) The *evangelical Protestant* (*Pauline*) doctrine of justification must be *maintained:*

(*aa.*) Against *Pharisæism*, *Pelagianism*, and *Rationalism*, or the doctrine of justification *by works*, which, in various forms and degrees, glorifies human ability and represents justification as a reward for man's own merit (legalism, self-righteousness, work-righteousness).

(*bb.*) Against the *semi-Pelagian* and the *Romish* or *Tridentine*, as well as the modern *Anglo-Romanizing* or *Tractarian* theory of justification by *faith and works*, which confounds justification with sanctification (*justitia infusa; ex injusto justus redditur*), makes it depend on the degree of personal holiness, teaches the meritoriousness of good works (*opera meritoria proportionata vitæ æternæ; meritum de congruo* and *meritum de condigno; opera supererogationis*), and divides the glory of our salvation between God and man.

(*cc.*) Against ultra- and pseudo-Protestant *Solifidianism* and *Antinomianism*, which destroy the law, as a rule of conduct, tear justification from its proper antecedents and consequents, and deny the necessity of good works. (Amsdorf, a Lutheran divine of the sixteenth century, went so far as to assert that good works were pernicious or dangerous to salvation; while Major maintained the opposite thesis: *bona opera necessaria ad salutem*. The result of this controversy was the distinction that good works were necessary, not as a condition of salvation, but as the evidence of saving faith; and that not good works, but only such reliance on them as interfered with trust in the merits of Christ, was dangerous to salvation.)

(*dd.*) Against subjective *Spiritualism* and unchurchly *Fanaticism*, which resolve justification by faith into a justification by *feeling*, and despise or ignore the Church and the sacraments, as the regular, divinely appointed means of grace.

On the *doctrinal* aspect of justification by faith, comp. Chemnitz, *Concil. Trident.*, tom. i., lib. viii.; Gerhard, *Loci Theologici*, tom. vii.; John Davenant (Bishop of Salisbury), *Disputatio de justitia habituali et actuali*, 1631, English translation by Josiah Allport, London, 1844–'46, 2 vols. (a standard work of the Anglican Church against the Romish doctrine); my *Principle of Protestantism*, 1845, p. 54 ff.; Bishop Ch. P. M'Ilvaine, *Righteousness by Faith; or the Nature and Means of Justification before God* (against the Romanizing doctrine of the Oxford Tracts), Phila., 2d ed., 1864; Dr. James Buchanan, *The Doctrine on Justification: an Outline of its History in the Church, and of its Exposition from Scripture*, Edinburgh, 1867; the respective sections in the works on Symbolics; several recent dogmatic essays on the subject, by Dorner, 1867, translated by C. A. Briggs for the *Am. Presb Theol. Rev.*, New York, April, 1868, pp. 186–214 Riggenbach, in the *Studien and Kritiken* for April, 1868, pp. 201–248; an article in the *British and Foreign Evang. Review* for January, 1862, which is fully criticised by Forbes, *on Rom.* p. 125 ff. The *exegetical* essays have been mentioned in comments on chap. i. 17, pp. 75, 76.—P. S.[1]

6. On *ἱλαστήριον*, *ἱλασμός*, and *ἀπολύτρωσις*, see the *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 25. For more detailed information, see my *Positive Dogmatics*, p. 818 ff. As recent efforts have been made to set aside the true doctrine of atonement itself by refuting the view of Anselm,* it should be remembered that the defects in Anselm's theory were acknowledged even in the Middle Ages, but that they cannot destroy its relative truth and value. The real idea of the atonement cannot be clearly apprehended without understanding the meaning of compassion, of sympathy, of reconciliation in Christ, of the divine judgment-seat in the sinner's conscience, and of the connection of judgment and deliverance in the sufferings of Christ as well as in the sinner's conversion.

7. God is the righteous Judge and the justifying God: (1.) In the same grace; (2.) In the objective work of redemption, or in justification by faith.

8. When the Apostle, in ver. 27, contrasts a law of works and a law of faith as excluding each other, and then says in ver. 31: "We establish the law," it follows that he only recognizes that antithesis in ver. 27 as one which the external legalism of the Jews had made; or as the appearance of the antithesis between the economy of the Old and New Testaments, but that his own view was based upon a deeper unity.

9. It is well known that very much has been written about Luther's *sola*, ver. 28. This word is perfectly true so far as it is contrasted with *ἔργα νόμου*, for the reading is *χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου*, *without* works of the law. Therefore the *sola* is even positively exclusive. But does it also exclude *works of faith?* Answer: As soon as a work of faith is added to faith, it is made an *ἔργον νόμου*, a work of the law. If the work remains a mere phenomenon or manifestation of faith, it has no separate significance in itself.

[Dr. Donne, a standard divine of the Church of England, originally a convert from Romanism (died 1631), in Serm. ii. on John xvi. 8–11, makes the following apt remarks on this *sola fide:* "Faith is but one of those things which in several senses are said to justify us. It is truly said of God, *Deus solus justificat;* God only justifies us—*efficienter;* nothing can effect it, nothing can work towards it, but only the mere goodness of God. And it is truly said of Christ, *Christus solus justificat;* Christ only justifies us—*materialiter;* nothing enters into the substance and body of the ransom of our sins but the obedience of Christ. It is also truly said, *sola fides justificat;* only faith justifies us—*instrumentaliter;* nothing apprehends, nothing applies the merit of Christ to thee, but thy faith. And lastly, it is as truly said, *sola opera justificant;* only our works justify us—*declaratoriè;* only thy good life can assure thy conscience, and the world, that thou art justified. As the efficient justification, the gracious purpose of God, had done us no good without the material satisfaction, the death of Christ, that followed; and as that material satisfaction, the death of Christ, would do me no good without the instrumental justification, the apprehension by faith; so neither would this profit without the declaratory justification, by which all is pleaded and established. God enters not into our material justification: that is only Christ's. Christ enters not into our instrumental justification: that is only faith's. Faith enters not into our declaratory justification (for faith is secret), and declaration belongs to works. Neither of these can be said to justify us alone, so as that we may take the chain in pieces, and think to be justified by any one link thereof—by God without Christ, by Christ without faith, or by faith without works. And yet every one of these justifies us alone, so as that none of the rest enter into that way and that means by which any of these are said to justify us." Comp. my foot-note on ver. 28, p. 136.—P. S.]

10. Ver. 29. Paul did not need any longer to prove from the Scriptures that God was also the God of the Gentiles. The first phenomenon of the New Covenant: Blessedness of faith, speaking with tongues, and a new life, was, with the Apostles, equivalent everywhere to scriptural proofs, and served for the exposition of the Old Testament. It was, indeed, the specific New Testament evidence which precedes with Paul the argument from the Old Testament in chap. iv.

11. On the means by which Christianity chiefly *establishes the law*, see the *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 31. The Judaism of the Old Testament first attained its universal historical glory by Christianity, and its thanks are due especially to Paul, who was so hated by the Jews. [Bishop Sanderson (*Sermon* on 1 Peter ii. 16, as quoted by Ford): "The law may be considered as a *rule;* or, as a *covenant.* Christ has freed all believers from the rigor and curse of the law, considered as a covenant; but He has not freed them from obedience to the law, considered as a rule. . . . The law, as a rule, can no more be abolished or changed, than can the nature of good or evil be abolished or changed."—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Chap. iii. 21–26.

The revelation of the righteousness of faith through Jesus Christ which is efficacious in God's sight. It comes to pass: 1. *Without the assistance of the law,* although testified by the law and the prophets; 2. *For all sinners,* without distinction, who believe; 3. *By the redemption* effected by Jesus Christ the Mediator, who proffers the righteousness which is acceptable to God (vers. 21–26).—The testimony of the law and the prophets concerning the righteousness which is acceptable to God: 1. Of the law by its typical reference to the atonement; 2. Of the prophets by the Messianic prophecies (ver. 21).—The Apostle takes from the law what does not belong to it, and concedes what does belong to it. He denies: 1. Its alleged coöperation in the righteousness which is acceptable to God. But he concedes to it: 2. The testimony of the future atonement (ver. 21).—The universality of grace corresponding to the universality of sin (vers. 22–24).—What sort of confession should we make to God daily as evangelical Christians? Two kinds: 1. We are altogether sinners, and come short of the glory we should have before God; 2. We are justified freely by His grace, &c. (vers. 23–24).—Christ set forth by God to be a propitiation (mercy-seat) through faith in His blood: 1. To what end? To offer His righteousness at this (present) time; 2. Why? Because in time past He could pass over sin

* [As set forth in his celebrated tract, *Cur Deus Homo.* An able and vigorous, but unsuccessful attempt to set aside the orthodox view of the atonement has been made in America by Dr. Bushnell, *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, New York, 1866. Comp. also the English work of Young on *Christ the Light and Life of the World*, 1867, and Jowett's excursus on the *Doctrine of the Atonement* (*Rom.*, p. 468 ff. —P. S.]

by His Divine forbearance, and thereby shake faith in His justice (vers. 25, 26).—Divine forbearance (ver. 25).—God the only just One, and therefore the only Justifier (ver. 21).

LUTHER: "All have sinned," &c. This is the chief portion and central part of this Epistle, and of the whole Scripture. Therefore understand this text well, for the merit and glory of all works,—as he himself says,—are done away with, and God's grace and glory alone remain (ver. 28).—Sin could be removed neither by laws nor by any good works; that must be done by Christ and His forgiveness (ver. 25).—Faith fulfils all laws, but works cannot fulfil a single tittle of the law (ver. 31).

STARKE: There is only one kind of justification in the Old and New Testaments; namely, that which is by faith in Christ (ver. 21).—To have a believing heart, is to hunger and thirst after the grace of God in Christ, and to appropriate the righteousness of Christ for our spiritual satisfaction and refreshment (ver. 22).—Do not make a wrong use of this passage against active Christianity, for God's image must be restored in us in the order of the new birth and daily renewal (ver. 28).—Grace and righteousness are the two principal attributes of God which are proved in the work of our salvation. Therefore one cannot be separated from the other, either in the cause or order of our salvation (ver. 24).—The faith which appropriates the blood of Jesus Christ and His expiatory death, and presents them to God the Lord, is the only means by which Christ becomes also our mercy-seat (ver. 25).—If you are ever so distinguished and wealthy, and are deficient in true and living faith, you can neither be justified nor saved (ver. 26).

OSIANDER: No doctrine must be accepted in the Church of God to which God's word does not bear witness (ver. 21).—LANGE: The merit of the blood of Christ is not only the object which faith grasps, but also the foundation on which it firmly rests (ver. 25).—HEDINGER: Christ our righteousness! Oh, the glorious consolation, which screens us from the wrath of God, the curse of the law, and eternal death! No work, no perfection out of Christ; but faith alone makes us dear children of God—righteous, holy, and blessed (ver. 25).

BENGEL: Under the law, God appears just and condemning; under the gospel, just, and yet justifying the guilty sinner.

LISCO: The *nature* of evangelical righteousness is, that it is obtained by faith in Jesus Christ; and it comes to *all* and upon *all* who believe in Him. Like a flood of grace it flows to all, and even so overflows as to reach even the heathen. It is therefore a righteousness by faith, and not a righteousness by works.—In the work of redemption, God's holiness and grace, justice and forbearance, are revealed (vers. 25, 26).

HEUBNER: The difficult question is now solved: "How can the sinner find redemption from his sins?" Christianity replies: *Believe in Christ* (ver. 22).—How is the righteousness which God accepts testified by the law and the prophets? 1. By this means: all forgiveness, all redemption, is everywhere described in the Scriptures as the free work of God's grace; neither the offering, nor man's own merit, was sufficient for this end; 2. In the emphatic prophecies of a future Redeemer (ver. 21).—Unworthiness before God is universal. This is the first prostrating word of revelation: Know that thou art a sinner, a poor sinner; that is, who hast nothing, and must get something from God (ver. 23).—Christ's redemption is: 1. A ransom (Matt. xx. 28) from the *guilt* of sin (Eph. i. 7); 2. A ransom from the *punishment* of sin (Rom. v. 9); 3. A ransom from the *dominion* of sin (1 Peter i. 18; ver. 23).—The subjective condition of redemption is faith as a faith of the heart, which reposes its confidence on Christ's sacrificial death—a faith that Christ died for *me*. This *for me* is the great thing! (ver. 26.)—On vers. 23-25, REINHARD preached his celebrated Reformation Sermon (ii. 270) in the year 1800: "The great reason why our Church should never forget that it owes its existence to the renewal of the doctrine of God's free grace in Christ."

BESSER: The law impels toward righteousness, but it does not confer it.—There are not two orders of salvation, one for Jews and honorable people, and the other for heathen and publicans; but there is only one for all.—We are justified: 1. Without merit; 2. By God's grace; 3. Through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (ver. 24).—The highest declaration of God's grace is at the same time the highest declaration of His justice.

J. P. LANGE: The fact of salvation is also a miraculous work of God (ver. 21).—Redemption as the second and higher world of miracle in relation to the natural world of miracle.—Golgotha is more exalted than Sinai in respect also to God's justice.—The lightning-flash of New Testament justice: 1. Killing; 2. Making alive.

[BURKITT: Vers. 24-26. We see here: 1. A glorious privilege for believers, *justification;* 2. Its efficient cause, *God;* 3. The moving or impulsive cause, *free grace;* 4. The meritorious cause, *the blood shedding and death of Christ;* 5. The final cause, *the declaration of His righteousness;* 6. The instrumental cause, *faith*.—Oh, glorious and all-wise contrivance, whereby God made sufficient provision for the reparation of His honor, for the vindication of His holiness, for the manifestation of His truth and faithfulness, and for the present consolation and eternal salvation of all repenting and believing sinners to the end of the world!—MATTHEW HENRY: Ver. 25. Christ is the propitiation—there is the healing plaster provided. Faith is the applying of this plaster to the wounded soul.—Faith is the bunch of hyssop, and the blood of Christ is the blood of sprinkling.—DWIGHT devotes six sermons to the subject of *Justification*, in which he treats of its nature, source, and means; duty of believing; nature of faith; influence of faith on justification; reconciliation of Paul and James on justification; influence of works on justification; and justification by faith no diminution of motives to obedience (*Theology*, vol. ii., pp. 515-605).—CLARKE: vers. 23-24. As God is no respecter of persons, all human creatures being equally His offspring, and there being no reason why one should be preferred before another, therefore His mercy has embraced all.—The redemption of Christ comprehends whatsoever He taught, did, or suffered, in order to free men from evil.—HODGE: As the cardinal doctrine of the Bible is justification by faith, so the turning-point in the soul's history, the saving act, is the reception of Jesus Christ as the propitiation for our sins.—All modes of preaching must be erroneous, which do not lead sinners to feel that the great thing to be done, and done first, is to receive the Lord Jesus Christ, and to turn unto God through Him. And all religious experience must be defective, which does not embrace distinctly a sense of the justice

of our condemnation, and a conviction of the sufficiency of the work of Christ, and an exclusive reliance upon it as such.—J. F. H.]

On Chap. iii. 27–31.

The exclusion of man's self-glorification. Its results: 1. Not by the law of works; but, 2. By the law of faith (ver. 27).—How are we justified? 1. Not by the works of the law; but, 2. By faith alone (ver. 28).—"Only by faith"—Luther's watchword, and also the watchword of the evangelical church of the present day (ver. 28).—The righteousness of the law and the righteousness of faith (ver. 28).—God, a God of all people, because He is only one God (vers. 29, 30).—Faith in the one God considered as the source of the true kind of universalism (vers. 29, 30).—The popular saying of religious indifferentism: "We all believe in one God," is only true when we also believe that this God also justifies those who believe (vers. 29, 30).—The proof that the law is not made void through faith, but established, is supplied by both the deeds and doctrine: 1. Of the Lord; 2. Of His apostles, and especially of Paul (ver. 31).

Luther: Faith keeps all the laws, while works keep no point of the law (James ii. 10).—[A passage in the preface to the Epistle to the Romans is also in place here: Faith is not that human folly and dream which some take for faith. But faith is a divine work in us, which changes us and creates us anew in God, &c.]

Starke: Faith alone justifies and saves; but you must not take away works from faith in order to beautify your sinful life, or it will become unbelief.—There are many forms of arbitrary will on earth, and yet but one way to salvation. God would save all men, and yet by only one way.

Hedinger: Christianity, with its doctrine of faith, opens no door for sin, but shows how we can be obedient to the law with a filial spirit for God's sake (chap. iii. 31).—Quesnel: The more faith in a soul the less pride there is in it.

Gerlach, from Chrysostom: What is the law of faith? Salvation by grace. Herein God's power is declared, not only in delivering men, but also in justifying them and raising them to glory; for God did not stand in need of works, but sought faith alone.—True, the word *alone* is not in the text literally, but yet it is there in sense, as it is expressly declared in Gal. ii. 16, 17; without faith, nothing can justify.

Heubner: Christianity unites humanity by one God, by one Father, who is the Saviour of all.—The unity of faith in grace should also establish the unity of hearts.

Spener: Looking at the subject in its true light, faith is not that which itself justifies man—for its strength would be far too small for this work—but faith only accepts the most powerful grace of God as a proffered gift, and thus permits man to be saved by it, instead of its really justifying and saving him. This is the great doctrine of this Epistle, on which every thing rests, and from which every thing must be derived.

Lange: Therefore we judge, &c., and thus it stands (ver. 28). True salvation of the inner life a witness: 1. Of the true faith; 2. Of the true gospel; 3. Of the true God.

[Burkitt: Ver. 31. The moral, not the ceremonial law. The moral law is established by the gospel; Christ has relaxed the law in point of danger, but not in point of duty.—Henry: Ver. 27 If we were saved by our own works, we might put the crown upon our own heads. But the law of faith, the way of justification by faith, doth forever exclude boasting; for faith is a depending, self-emptying, self-denying grace, and casts every crown before the throne: therefore it is most for God's glory, that thus we should be justified.—Macknight: Ver. 28. Faith in God and Christ necessarily leads those who possess it to believe every thing made known to them by God and by Christ, and to do every thing which they have enjoined; so that it terminates in the sincere belief of the doctrines of religion, and in the constant practice of its duties, as far as they are made known to the believer.—Clarke: *Why did not God make known this grand method of salvation sooner?* 1. To make it the more valued; 2. To show His fidelity in the performance of His promises; 3. To make known the virtue and efficacy of the blood of Christ, which sanctifies the *present*, extends its influence to the *past*, and continues the availing sacrifice and way of salvation to all *future* ages.—Hodge: The doctrine of atonement produces in us its proper effect, when it leads us to see and feel that God is just; that He is infinitely gracious; that we are deprived of all ground of boasting; that the way of salvation which is open for us, is open for all men; and that the motives to all duty, instead of being weakened, are enforced and multiplied.—In the gospel, all is harmonious: justice and mercy, as it regards God; freedom from the law, and the strongest obligations to obedience, as it regards men.—Barnes: One of the chief glories of the plan of salvation is, that while it justifies the sinner, it brings a new set of influences from heaven, more tender and mighty than can be drawn from any other source, to produce obedience to the law of God.—J. F. H.]

[Homiletical Literature on Justification (in the order of the text).—Coccejus, *De Justificatione*, op. 7, 180, T. W. Allies, *Serm.* 1; B. Hill, *Serm.* 95; E. Cooper, *Lead. Doct.*, 1. 20; M. Harrison, several sermons on *Justification* (1691); E. Bather, *Serm.* 2, 248; T. Boston, *Works*, 1, 581; S. Knight, *Serm.* 2, 15; A. Fuller, *Three Sermons on Justification, Serm.* 176; W. B. Collyer, *On Script. Doct.*, 329; Bishop Hobart, *Serm.* 2, 32; W. Bridge, *Works*, 5, 364; C. Simeon, *Works*, 15, 79; A. Burgess, *On Justification* (Two Parts); J. Hoole, *Serm.* 2, 217; W. Stevens, *Serm.* 1, 268; Bishop Halifax, *St. Paul's Doctrine of Justification by Faith Explained*, 2d. ed., Camb. 1762; T. Randolph, *Doctrine of Justification by Faith;* H. Worthington, *Disc.* 315; S. Disney, *Disc.* 125; P. Hutcheson, *Serm.;* T. Young, *Justification*, &c.; E. Parsons, *Justification by Faith*, Halifax, 1821; J. C. Miller, *Serm.* 359; J. Johnston, *Way of Life*, 85; T. T. Smith, *Serm.* 289; W. Shirley, *Serm.* 151; J. Whitty, *Serm.* i. 413; J. Wesley, *Works* (Amer. ed.), vol. i. 47, 385; vol. ii. 40, 236; vol. iii. 158, 172, 259; vol. v. 37–442; vol. vi. 6–195; vol. vii. 47.—The *Periodical Homiletical Literature* on the same subject is very abundant. We give the principal articles: *Justification by Faith* (R. W. Landis), *Amer. Bibl. Repository*, xi. 453; (D. Curry) *Meth Quart. Rev.*, iv. 5; v. 5; (C. D. Pidgeon) *Lit. and Theol. Rev.*, vi. 521; *Princeton Rev.*, xii. 268, 561, *Justification by Works*.—J. F. H.]

EIGHTH SECTION.—*Second proof of the righteousness of faith:* FROM THE SCRIPTURES, *and particularly from the history of the faith of Abraham, the ancestor of the Jews. Abraham is the father of faith to the Gentiles as well as the Jews, because he was justified in uncircumcision as a Gentile, and because he received circumcision as the seal of the righteousness of faith. David is also a witness of the righteousness of faith. (He is particularly so, since his justification was that of a great sinner.) Abraham, by his faith in the word of the personal God of revelation, and particularly in the promise of Isaac, is a type of believers in the saving miracle of the resurrection.*

CHAP. IV. 1-25.

1 What [, then,] shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to
2 the flesh, hath found [found according to the flesh]?[1] For if Abraham were
[was] justified by works [as is assumed by the Jews], he hath *whereof* to glory [he
3 hath ground of boasting];[2] but not before God. For what saith the Scripture?
Abraham believed God, and it was counted [reckoned] unto [to] him for right-
4 eousness [Gen. xv. 6]. Now to him that worketh [to the workman][3] is the
reward not reckoned of [according to, or, as a matter of] grace, but of
5 [according to, as a] debt. But to him that worketh not,[4] but believeth on him
6 that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted [reckoned] for righteousness. Even
as David also describeth the blessedness [happiness][5] of the man, unto whom God
7 imputeth righteousness without works, *Saying*, Blessed [Happy] *are* they whose
8 iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered [atoned for]. Blessed
[Happy] *is* the man to whom the Lord will not impute [reckon] sin [Ps. xxxii. 1, 2].[6]
9 *Cometh* this blessedness [happiness] then upon the circumcision *only*, or
[also] upon the uncircumcision also? For we say that faith was reckoned to
10 Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? when he was in cir-
cumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision.
11 And he received [Gen. xvii. 2] the [a] sign of circumcision,[7] [as?] a seal of the
righteousness of the faith which *he had yet* being uncircumcised [of the faith
in the uncircumcision, τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ, or, of the faith which he
had while in uncircumcision]: that he might be the father of all them that
believe, though they be not circumcised [while yet in uncircumcision]; that
12 righteousness might be imputed [reckoned also] unto them also:[8] And the
father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who
also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which *he had* being
yet uncircumcised [which he had while in uncircumcision].[9]
13 For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, *was* not to Abra-
ham, or to his seed, through the law [For not through (the) law *is* the promise
to Abraham, or to his seed, that he should be heir of the world], but through
14 the righteousness of faith. For if they which [who] are of the law [οἱ ἐκ νόμου]
be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none [no] effect [ren-
15 dered powerless]: Because the law worketh wrath: for where[10] no law is, *there*
16 *is* no transgression [but where there is no law, neither is there transgression
of the law]. Therefore *it is* of faith, that *it might be* by grace; to the end [in
order that] the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which
is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the
17 father of us all, (As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations
[A father of many nations have I set thee; Gen. xvii. 5],) before him whom he
believed,[11] *even* God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be
[are] not as though they were:
18 Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the [omit the]
father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be
19 [Gen. xv. 5]. And being not weak in faith, he considered not[12] his own body
now [already][13] dead, when he was [being] about a hundred years old, neither
20 yet the deadness of Sarah's womb: He staggered not at the promise of God
through unbelief [But with regard to the promise of God he wavered, or
doubted not in unbelief]; but was [made] strong in faith, giving glory to God

21 And[14] being fully persuaded, that what he had [hath] promised, he was [is]
22 able also to perform. And therefore [Wherefore also][15] it was imputed [reck-
oned] to him for righteousness.
23 Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed [reckoned]
24 to him; But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed [reckoned], if we believe
25 on him that [who] raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; Who was delivered
[up] for our offences, and was raised again [*rose* again] for our justification.[16]

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 1.—The reading in Lachmann, εὑρηκέναι Ἀβρ. τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν, is not only mostly authenticated (A. B. C., &c.), but, if well understood, it also gives the best sense; and we regard the opposite reading, which is now generally favored, as an explanatory transposition. See the *Exeg. Notes.* [The *text. rec.* puts Ἀβραὰμ τὸν πατέρα (not προπάτορα) ἡμῶν *before* εὑρηκέναι. Cod. Sin. sustains the reading of Lachmann, which is also adopted by Alford, who, however, brackets εὑρηκέναι as being of doubtful authority, since it is omitted by the Vatican Cod. (see Tischendorf's edition, p. 1448). But it is indispensable, and abundantly sustained by the other uncial MSS. Meyer admits the weight of external authority in favor of Lachmann's reading, but is disposed, nevertheless, to regard it as a later transposition to suit the connection of κατὰ σάρκα with τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν. The E. V., following the *text. rec.*, adopts this connection, and Dr. Lange defends it in the *Exeg. Notes.* But with the majority of modern commentators, including Meyer, Alford, Hodge, I prefer to join κατὰ σάρκα with εὑρηκέναι. This is indeed necessary, if we follow the *lectio recepta*, and it is perfectly allowable, though not so natural, if we adopt the reading of Lachmann. In this case we must translate: *What, then, shall we say that Abraham our father (forefather) found* (or, *gained, attained*) *according to (the) flesh* (or, *in the way of the flesh*)—*i. e.*, through his own natural efforts as distinct from the grace of God. Grotius: *propriis viribus;* De Wette, and others: *nach rein menschlicher Weise.* Meyer takes σάρξ here as the weak, unspiritual, sinful human nature. Abraham did indeed attain righteousness, but by faith, not by works. Codd. ℵ. A. B. C*. sustain προπάτορα for the πατέρα of the *Rec.*—P. S.]

[2] Ver. 2.—[Lange translates; *er hat Ruhm, glory.* καύχημα (as also καύχησις) in the N. T., and in the LXX., means generally (not *always*, as Meyer says, p. 160) the *object* or *ground* of boasting, *materia gloriandi;* Rom. iv. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 15, 16; 2 Cor. i. 14; Gal. vi. 4; Phil. i. 26; ii. 16; and sometimes, as in the classics, the *act* of boasting or exulting, *gloriatio;* 1 Cor. v. 6; 2 Cor. v. 12; ix. 3.—P. S.]

[3] Ver. 4.—[τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ is well rendered by Luther: *dem der mit Werken umgeht.* Lange: *dem welcher den Werkdienst treibt.* Meyer: *dem Werkthätigen.* The word is frequent, and signifies a workman who works for pay. Conybeare and Howson, too freely: *if a man earns his pay by his work.* Young: too literally: *to him who is working.* —P. S.]

[4] Ver. 5.—[τῷ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, *to him who worketh not for hire—der nicht Werkdienst treibt.*—P. S.]

[5] Ver. 6.—[μακαρισμόν, in allusion to the Hebrew form אַשְׁרֵי, *Oh, the blessedness*, or, *happiness of.* The N. T. of the Amer. Bible Union, and Robert Young, render μακάριος, here and elsewhere, even in the Sermon on the Mount, by *happy*, instead of *blessed*, which properly corresponds to εὐλογητός. There is the same difference between the German *glücklich* and *selig.* In a popular English Bible, I would retain *blessed* and *blessedness* where *religious* or *eternal* happiness is spoken of. The E. V. is inconsistent, and, without a fixed rule, alternates between *happy* and *blessed.*—P. S.]

[6] Vers. 7, 8.—[From Ps. xxxii., which describes the happiness and the condition of the forgiveness of sins. The following is a literal version of vers. 1 and 2:

Blessed (Happy) is he whose transgression is forgiven,
Whose sin is covered.
Blessed (Happy) is the man
To whom Jehovah imputeth not iniquity,
And in whose spirit there is no guile.

Ewald (*Die Psalmen*, 3d ed., 1866, p. 65) renders the passage thus:

Selig dessen Missethat vergeben,
Dessen Sünde ist verziehn!
Seliger Mensch dem Jahve nicht anrechnet Schuld,
Und in dessen Geiste keine Täuschung!—P. S.]

[7] Ver. 11.—The accusative περιτομήν [A. C*. Syr.] does not really change the thought, but rather strengthens it. It is probably an alteration or oversight [caused by the surrounding accusatives. The genitive περιτομῆς is attested by ℵ. B. C[2]. D. F. K. L., &c.—P. S.]

[8] Ver. 12.—καὶ αὐτοῖς must be retained, contrary to Lachmann. [καί is wanting in ℵ. B. Meyer defends it. —P. S.]

[9] Ver. 13.—Τῆς ἐν (τῇ) ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως [ℵ. A. B. C. D[1]., &c., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford]. The opposite reading is τῆς πίστ. τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβ. [Recommended by Griesbach, adopted by Scholz—contrary to the majority of the uncial MSS. It looks like a mechanical adjustment to ver. 11. τῇ is also to be omitted.—P. S.]

[10] Ver. 15.—οὗ δέ is probably an exegetical correction; though strongly attested by A. B. C., Griesbach, Lachmann. [The *text. rec.* reads οὗ γάρ, FOR *where*, which is supported by ℵ[3]. D. F. K. L., while ℵ[1]. favors οὗ δέ, BUT *where.*—P. S.]

[11] Ver. 17.—ἐπίστευσας, Codd. F. G., Luther [*credidisti, dem du geglaubt hast*, as if it was part of the Scripture quotation, instead of ἐπίστευσεν, *credidit*, which is sustained by Cod. Sin.—P. S.]

[12] Ver. 19.—The οὐ is wanting in the celebrated Codd. A. B. C. [and Sin.]. Also in Lachmann. According to Meyer, this omission arose from regard to Gen. xvii. 17. It could also have been occasioned by the antithesis in ver. 20. [The οὐ is inserted in D. F. K. L., Lat., Syr., &c. Alford brackets it. See *Exeg. Notes.*—P. S.]

[13] Ver. 19.—The ἤδη is wanting in B. F. G., &c. [and thrown out by Fritzsche and Tischendorf, but sustained by ℵ. A. C. D. K. L. Lachmann and Alford bracket it.—P. S.]

[14] Ver. 21.—The καί is sustained by A. B. C., &c., Lachmann. [Cod. Sin. likewise favors καί, and Alford retains it.—P. S.]

[15] Ver. 22.—[The καί after διό is omitted by B. D[1]. F., but inserted by ℵ. A. C. D[3]. K. L. Lachmann and Alford bracket it.—P. S.]

[16] Ver. 25.—[Luther, to whom above all others the Christian world is indebted for a lucid and forcible exposition of Paul's doctrine of justification by faith, has made a strange mistake here by translating δικαίωσιν: *Gerechtigkeit* (righteousness), instead of: *Rechtfertigung* (justification). δικαίωσις is the divine act of setting a man right, or putting him into the state and possession of δικαιοσύνη.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

General Remarks.—The theocratical Scripture proof for the righteousness of faith promised to the Gentiles as well as the Jews. Enlargement of the Mosaic economy of particularism by the development of the germ-like universality of the Abrahamic religion. *Survey:* 1. *Abraham's justification was a justification by faith, and excluded justification by works. It was therefore only a justification of the sinner*, as is shown by the beatitude pronounced by David (vers. 1-8). The opposite is the Jewish righteousness of works. 2. *It was independent of circumcision and the law.* Abraham did not obtain the blessedness of justifying faith in circumcision, but in uncircumcision; circumcision was then added to it as a seal of justification. Abraham was thereby set forth to be the father of the faithful, as well of the uncircumcised as of the circumcised (vers. 9-12). The opposite is Jewish particularism. 3. *Justification is as universal as the promise, which constitutes even an antithesis to the law.* Abraham's justification is to him and to his seed a promise of the inheritance of the world. This promise is not limited by the law. Such a limitation would make the promise void; for the law produces that wrath (ὀργή), which looks rather to the destruction than the inheritance of the world. The promise is both conditioned and established by faith and grace (vers. 13-17). The opposite is Jewish legalism. 4. *Abraham and Christians have in reality the same righteousness of faith.* The analogy between Abraham's faith and that of his believing children,—Christians: *a.* In relation to the same wonder-working God (ver. 17). *b.* In relation to the same conduct of faith: looking away from the contradiction of the natural life; strong confidence in the Divine word of revelation and promise (vers. 18-21). *c.* In reference to the same operation (vers. 22-25). The opposite is the external and superficial contemplation of the worldly sense.—Or also: *a.* The faith of Abraham (vers. 17-22); *b.* Application to the faith of Christians (vers. 23-25). The opposite, in general, is the hierarchical formalism and ceremonialism.

FIRST PARAGRAPH, VERS. 1-8.

[Paul exhibits Abraham as a truly evangelical character, as a man of faith, in order to confirm the doctrine that the ground of our salvation lies not in us, but outside of us in the free grace of God, and that this must be apprehended first by faith, before we can do any good works. James, on the other hand (ii. 21 ff.), in opposition to a barren orthodoxy and mere notional belief, represents Abraham as a man of holy obedience, who proved his faith by works. In the one case he appears as the champion of the righteousness of faith, in the other as the champion of the righteousness of life. Both views are right. Paul goes to the root of the matter, the vital principle, which animated Abraham; James looks at the fruit produced thereby. Faith and works, righteousness and holiness, are as inseperable as light and heat, as the tree and the fruit, as cause and effect. Paul himself, after laying the only true foundation, as strongly insists upon a holy life as James. There is, in the Old Testament, an evangelical as well as a legal element; and the gospel, or promise, precedes the law which came in between the promise and the fulfilment (ver. 20). Abraham represents the evangelical element, as Moses does the legal. Abraham's faith differs from the Christian faith, as the promise differs from the fulfilment of the gospel salvation, and as hope differs from fruition; but the essential element, the ethical key-note, in both is unconditional confidence and trust in God's truth and God's mercy.—P. S.]

Ver. 1. **What, then, shall we say.** The οὖν announces an inference from the previous statement (iii. 29), that God is the God of the Jews as well as of the Gentiles, considered in relation to Abraham's history and its significance. But our inference is not a corroboration (Meyer), or *confirmatio ab exemplo* (Calvin). We have here rather a new proof, as deduced from the foregoing, namely, the explanation of Abraham's history and of David's words of faith. Likewise Tholuck observes, the οὖν cannot be explained if, in accordance with the view of recent expositors, this verse be connected immediately with ver. 31 of the previous chapter.—*The construction:* It may be asked, first, whether the question should be read as one question, or two? Grotius and others have placed an interrogation mark after ἐροῦμεν, and thus made two questions out of the sentence. Then δικαιοσύνην is supplied to εὑρηκέναι.—If the εὑρηκέναι be taken absolutely in the sense of the Grecian philosophy, this division could be made more easily. Yet the chief question here is not, what should be said, but what is Abraham's advantage?—It may further be asked, whether κατὰ σάρκα relates to προπάτορα (πατέρα) or to εὑρηκέναι. Lachmann's reading: τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν εὑρηκέναι Ἀβρ, &c., [see *Textual Note* [1]], is the one most favored by the Codd. (A. C. D., &c., and also the Sin.). "The suspicion that the transposition of the κατὰ σάρκα [of εὑρηκέναι rather.—P. S.] is to be laid to the charge of the copyist, is strengthened when we see that such expositors as Chrysostom, Theophylact, Gennadius in Œcumenius, who read εὑρηκέναι κατὰ σάρκα, nevertheless connect the latter with πατὴρ ἡμῶν" (Tholuck, p. 167). De Wette, Meyer [Tholuck, Alford, Wordsworth, Hodge], and most commentators, with the Peshito, connect κατὰ σάρκα with εὑρηκέναι, and not (according to Origen, Ambrose, Calvin,* &c.) with πατέρα ἡμῶν. But in ver. 9 ff., the subject is circumcision; while in vers. 1-8, it is only the contrast between righteousness by works and righteousness by faith. Therefore, according to Meyer's construction, κατὰ σάρκα should correspond to the ἐξ ἔργων, yet not so that the two ideas should be identical, but that works should be embraced in the more general idea of κατὰ σάρκα. The σάρξ, in antithesis to the divine πνεῦμα, should then denote humanity given up to itself. Pelagius, Ambrose, and others, refer κατὰ σάρκα to circumcision. Rückert understands the word as embracing both circumcision and ἔργα. While Tholuck consents to the now customary connection of the κατὰ σάρκα with εὑρηκέναι, he does not grant that the works of faithful Abraham were ἔργα κατὰ σάρκα; although Flacius would include likewise the *opera renati*, as performed by men and not imputed by God, in the *opera carnis*; and Bullinger and others would make σάρξ equal to

* [Hodge quotes Calvin for the opposite view, explaining κατὰ σάρκα in the sense *naturaliter, ex seipso.* But Calvin goes on to say: "*Probabile tamen est epitheti loco Patri conjungi*," and gives the preference to the construction with πατέρα.—P. S.]

ἔργα. Tholuck therefore arrives at the conclusion, that Paul did not design to apply Christian justification in all its consequences to the patriarch. But how could he represent him here as the father of the faithful, if he would belittle or limit his justification? We go upon the supposition that, in accordance with the best Codd., Ἀβραὰμ ὁ προπάτωρ ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα (ver. 1) is an antithesis to αὐτὸς πατὴρ πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων, &c. (ver. 11), and to ὅς ἐστιν πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν (ver. 16). The principal subject is, therefore, Abraham, the natural ancestor of the Jews; and if it be asked, What hath he found? the emphasis rests on τί, and this refers to the δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου (chap. iii. 28), and especially to ver. 29 also. As God is a God of the Jews and Gentiles, Abraham, the προπάτωρ of the Jews, has become a πατήρ of Jews and Gentiles.

Ver. 2. **For if Abraham was justified** [ἐδικαιώθη] **by works** [in the opinion of the Jews]. The answer assumes that the view that Abraham was justified by the works of the law, was already denied in the question. Yet this very thing was believed by the legalistic Jew. "In the Talmud it was even deduced from Gen. xxvi. 5, that Abraham observed the whole Mosaic law" (Meyer).* The answer does not therefore assume an οὐδέν [omitted before εἰ γάρ] or an οὐδοτιοῦν (Tholuck), because κατὰ σάρκα [ver. 1] does not stand in connection with εὑρηκέναι, [? comp. *Textual Note* [1].—P. S.] To the question, Which of the two kinds of righteousness? it assumes the conclusion, that it was not the imaginary righteousness of works, but the true righteousness of faith. The supposition is so plain, that the Apostle proceeds at once to the proof.—**Was justified by works.** The sense can be: if he *should be* so justified, it could only be at a human tribunal, and not at the tribunal of God—as has been already described. But it can also be understood thus: if Abraham, according to the national prejudice of the Jews, has been really justified *by works*. This is the more obvious view. Conceding this kind of justification, Abraham has a καύχημα (*materiam gloriandi*), but not before God. Not before God, first, because no flesh is justified by works in His sight (chap. iii. 20); second, because we know definitely from the Scriptures that Abraham was justified in God's sight, or at His tribunal, by faith. The ἐδικαιώθη is made by Beza, Grotius, and others, to refer to a *general* opinion pronounced on Abraham; but by Calvin, Calov., and others, to an *imaginary* opinion, under the supposition of an incomplete conclusion (the *major:* he who is justified by works hath whereof to glory. The *minor:* but not before God. The necessary concluding statement: therefore Abraham is not justified by works).†

Tholuck thinks, with Meyer, that reference to God cannot disappear from ἐδικαιώθη, and he follows him, with Theodoret, in explaining thus: "For if Abraham has been justified by God through works, he has certainly received—the perfect fulfilment of the law being granted,—glory, but not a divine glory, so far as such glory could not be traced back to God's grace." This explanation contradicts the previous suppositions: 1. That no flesh can be justified by the deeds of the law (chap. iii. 20); 2. That no external fulfilment of the law in the sense of νόμος ἔργων is conceivable, but only in the sense of νόμος πίστεως. A plain remark may aid in the understanding of this difficult passage: that δικαιοῦσθαι always refers to a definite tribunal, but that this tribunal may be very different according to the different relations of δικαιοῦσθαι. Thus the tribunal of Jewish national prejudice already mentioned was very different from that of the theocratical communion of faith itself, which the passage in James ii. 23 has in view (see the *Commentary on James*, chap. ii. Also, Ps. cvi. 31, on the justification of Phinehas). It has been counted to him for righteousness—*from generation to generation*, see Tholuck, p. 172, thereon. What Theodoret says is certainly true: that true justification before God must glorify the love of God; but for this very reason no other mode of justification before God is conceivable. (Singular explanation of Semler and others: Has he glory? No; before God, not! Protestation.)

Ver. 3. **For what saith the Scripture?** Paul makes a true representation of Abraham in accordance with the Scriptures, in opposition to the false representation of the Jews.*—[**But Abraham believed God, and it** (viz., *the believing*, τὸ πιστεῦσαι, which must be supplied from ἐπίστευσεν) **was reckoned to him for righteousness**, Ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. Gen. xv. 6, Sept. The emphasis lies on ἐπίστευσεν, placed first, or the faith of Abraham as distinct from works and as excluding merit on the part of man. Λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην, *to reckon*, or *count*, or *impute* to any one *as righteousness*, and consequently to treat him as righteous, is identical with δικαιόω (see p. 130). On the con-

* [Meyer quotes *Kiddush*, f. 82, 1; *Ioma*, f. 28, 2; *Beresh. rabba*, f. 57, 4. Tholuck says: "The justification of Abraham *before God* was a *locus communis* of Jewish theology." P. S.]

† [Calvin's interpretation is given by him (*ad* Rom. iv. 2) in these words: "*Epicherema* [ἐπιχείρημα, an attempted proof, an incomplete syllogism] *est*, i. e., *imperfecta ratiocinatio, quæ in hanc formam colligi debet: Si Abraham operibus justificatus est, potest suo merito gloriari; sed non habet unde glorietur apud Deum; ergo non ex operibus justificatus est. Ita membrum illud, 'Sed non apud Deum,' est minor propositio syllogismi. Huic attexi debet conclusio quam posui, tametsi a Paulo non exprimitur.*" Similarly Fritzsche: "*Si suis bene factis Dei favorem nactus est, habet, quod apud Deum glorietur . . . ; sed* NON *habet, quod apud Deum glorietur, quum libri s. propter* FIDEM, *non propter pulchre facta eum Deo probatum esse doceant . . . ; non est igitur Abr. ob bene facta Deo probatus.*" So also Krausold, Baur, Köstlin, Hodge. This interpretation would have been more clearly expressed thus: ἔχει καύχημα (πρὸς τὸν θεόν)· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔχει καύχημα πρὸς τὸν θεόν. But it certainly gives good sense and falls in best with the γάρ in ver. 3. We explain thus: If Abraham, as the Jews suppose, was justified by works, he has reason to glory before God (for then he can claim justification as a just reward for his merits, leaving no room for the display of God's mercy); but, according to the Scripture, he has no ground to glory before God, *for* (ver. 3) the Scripture derives his justification from faith in God or from something outside of him, and not from works of his own. Meyer, in his former editions, defended the untenable view that εἰ . . . ἐδικαιώθη was a question, and ἔχει . . . θεόν the negative answer; but, in his last editions, he returns, with Tholuck and Wordsworth, to the interpretation of the Greek fathers (Theodoret, Chrysostom, Theophylact), which would require in ver. 3, ἀλλά, instead of γάρ.—P. S.]

* [If ver. 3 contained the refutation of the inference, ver. 2, we would rather expect ἀλλὰ τί, instead of τί γάρ. But if the refutation is contained in ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς θεόν (ἔχει καύχημα), the γάρ is in its place and gives the proof for the answer from Gen. xv. 6, showing that justification proceeded not from any work which Abraham performed, but from God in whom he put his trust. See note on p. . Meyer, holding the old Greek interpretation of ver. 2, thus tries to explain the γάρ: "*Mit Recht sage ich:* οὐ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, *denn vom* GLAUBEN, *nicht von den* WERKEN *Abraham's leitet die Schrift ausdrücklich seine Rechtfertigung her, und zwar als etwas durch* ZURECHNUNG *Empfangenes.*"—P. S.]

troversy whether Abraham was justified PER *fidem* through the instrumentality of faith), as the Protestants rightly teach, or PROPTER *fidem* (on account of the merit of his faith), as the Romanists assert; compare the remarks of Tholuck, p. 173 ff.; also the note of Alford *in loc.* Hodge enters here into a lengthy discussion of the doctrine of imputation, pp. 164–175, partly polemical against Olshausen.—P. S.] The quotation of Gen. xv. 6, is from the Septuagint which has changed the active verb וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ into the passive ἐλογίσθη. Paul uses the more prominent expression δέ instead of the καί of the Septuagint. Different explanations: 1. Rückert: Paul incorrectly used the passage for his purpose. 2. Roman Catholic expositors (and Bucer): Abraham submitted to the authority of God's word, and that gave value to his faith. 3. Faith in the promise of a large posterity was, in view of its object, faith in the promise of the Messiah who was to come forth from his posterity (A Lapide, Calvin, Gerhard, Calov., and others). 4. Implicit faith in the Divine promise (Bullinger, and others). Tholuck adopts this view, though with hesitation. "Delitzsch, on Gen. xv. 5, having more regard for the historical interpretation, says: 'Every thing was contained in the person of Jehovah and in the promise of a numerous posterity to Abraham, which was separately disclosed and fulfilled in the New Testament time of redemption.' But faith in a numerous posterity cannot effect the same *nova obedientia* as faith in a *Christus satispatiens* and *satisfaciens* can effect." [Tholuck, p. 173.] Further particulars on the *nova obedientia* of Abraham may be read in Gen. xxii. According to Tholuck, we should not introduce into the faith of Abraham the faith in the Messiah. But yet we must not reject it. According to the promise in Gen. xii. 3, the question in Gen. xv. 5—the passage here in mind—could not be the promise of a merely natural posterity. It is certainly consistent with the principles of historical interpretation, when we are considering later decisions, to look back at the earlier ones which lie at their root. Meyer [p. 161] more appropriately remarks: "In the πιστεύειν τῷ θεῷ on the part of Abraham, Paul has perceived nothing really different from Christian πίστις; since Abraham's faith referred to the Divine *promise*, and indeed to *the* promise which he—one who was the friend of God, and illuminated by Him—has perceived to be the promise which embraced the future Messiah (John viii. 56)."

Yet, under the supposition of the substantial identity between the faith of Abraham and that of Christians, we shall need to lay stress on the difference in form: The faith of Abraham is the essential beginning of the specific faith of salvation in the Old Testament; the faith of Paul and his companions is the completion of the same in the New. Faith in general, as well as in each of its particular parts, undergoes a great metamorphosis in its passage from initial point to this terminal point.

But it remains the same faith in substance. And the peculiarity of this substance is, that the Divine object, and its human organic reception, constitute an indissoluble christological synthesis. The objective parts are: *a*. The personal God of revelation in His revelation; and especially as the creative, wonder-working God, who can call forth new salvation and life; *b*. His word of promise; *c*. The import of His word of promise—the future salvation of the nations with the seed of Abraham. Corresponding with these, are the subjective parts: *a*. The living knowledge, perception, and reception of the revealed God; *b*. Confident submission to the words of promise, against all the contradiction of sense and worldly appearance; *c*. The appropriation of the object of the promise as the principle and energy of the renewed life.

The operations correspond to this harmony of object and subject: 1. Justification. Freedom of conscience before God, according to the measure of the condemnation of conscience. The peace of God, Gen. xv. 2. The sacramental, symbolical seal, Gen. xvii., see ver. 11. 3. Confidence, and acquirement of new life from condemnation to death, or even from death itself—internal death.

All these separate parts exist as germs in Abraham's faith. De Wette, after an ill-founded remark on the Apostle's arbitrary dialectics and scriptural application, admirably says: "When the Apostle in this way unites the climax of religious development with the historical point of connection—for the developing series commenced with Abraham—he gives evidence of great historical penetration." Comp. the *Commentary on Genesis*, xv. 1-12.

Ver. 4. **Now to the workman** [τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ, Lange: *Dem aber, welcher den Werkdienst treibt*]. The statements of vers. 6 and 7 are two sentences, which establish the doctrine of justification by faith, as well in its divine as in its human character. The work does not reach up to God, His grace, or His heaven; but it belongs to the sphere of gain, and makes the remunerator the *debtor*—which cannot be said of God without impiety. But as God's grace is exalted above the claims of merit, so is man's faith exalted. The believer does not rely on merit, but on the gracious strength of Him who justifies the ungodly, and he receives the righteousness in proportion to his faith. The first sentence establishes negatively, that Abraham, according to his relation to God, could not be justified by works; the second sentence establishes positively, that justification presupposes a relation of God's grace to the sinner. It is therefore clearly intimated that Abraham was a sinner; besides, the introduction of David and his testimony proves conclusively that the justification is that of the sinner. But the root of the antithesis is in the ἐργαζόμενος and the μὴ ἐργαζόμενος; it is the continuation of the contrast in chap. ii. 7, 8. Those who strive untiringly, seek God as their only end; but partisans oppose God by their claims. The ἐργαζόμενος is not "the active man, whose characteristic is works" (Meyer), but he whose righteousness consists only of works, who relies on the merit of his works, and whose basis of confidence and pride are works. Therefore, his counterpart is not an οὐκ ἐργαζόμενος, but a μὴ ἐργ.

Is the reward (ὁ μισθός) **not reckoned according to** (as a matter of) **grace** (κατὰ χάριν). That is, the *earned reward*, in accordance with the law of wages and labor. The λογίζεσθαι is a very flexible idea; in the case of works, denoting a literal settling up, a payment, according to the external *quantitative* relations; and in the case of faith, a respectful valuation or reward, according to the internal *qualitative* relations. But even in the latter case, there is no fiction, no untruth, but a decision in strict conformity with the actual condition. He who makes God his debtor for service rendered, reverses the poles of spiritual life; he conceits that God exists for his sake, and for the

sake of his external work. Therefore, the mere worker becomes a culpable debtor in the judgment of God. Faith is the return to the normal relation with God. Here God is the absolute majesty, the justifier, the source, the giver of all things, the infinitely merciful; and before Him the believer stands in the sense of absolute need, dependence, poverty, impurity, and guilt. But when the believer commits himself to the burning and delivering arms of God's love, his guilt vanishes as the cloud before the sun.—**Not according to grace, but according to (as a) debt.** The ἐργαζόμενος really declines grace; he claims a reward for his merit. And in the same way will his reward be reckoned according to his *debt.* Ὀφείλημα, the *debitum*, according to the relations of reward.—It is plain that such a relation did not apply to Abraham, from the fact that, according to ver. 3, he obtained God's grace; and this in a definite case, where the question could not be one of merit (Gen. xv.).

Ver. 5. **But to him that worketh not** (for hire), &c. Meyer properly remarks, in opposition to Reiche, who refers the statement directly to Abraham,* that the sentence is a *locus communis*, and that it is left to the reader whether he will include Abraham in it or not. But, according to Paul, Abraham has certainly included himself. In the same way, Meyer properly observes that ἀσεβής, **ungodly**, must not be diluted into ἄδικος, unrighteous. Faith perceives that the foundation of the ἀδικία is the ἀσέβεια (chap. i. 21), alienation from God; and, because of its deeper knowledge of sin, applies to the grace of God. The πιστεύειν ἐπί τινα cannot merely denote a faith in the direction toward some one, but a believing self-surrender on the ground of God's grace (Acts xvi. 31, &c.).

Ver. 6. **Even as David.** The introduction of David completely establishes the fact that the justification of man is a justification of the sinner, and that the believer perceives his sins; for, in relation to David, both his guilt and pardon were conceded by the Jews. And now David must also testify to this truth. *Even as* (καθάπερ) indicates that David is quoted for the elucidation and proof of what has been said already in vers. 4 and 5. He is quoted, not as a universal example of justification in general, but in special proof that it is such a justification of the sinner as excludes the merit of works. [Vers. 7 and 8 prove clearly that the forgiveness of sins belongs to justification; but this is only the negative part, with which is inseparably connected the positive part, namely, the imputation and application of the righteousness of Christ, and this contains the germ and power of sanctification.—P. S.] Tholuck: "By the negative statement, Calvin was led to insist that the idea of the *justificatio* is exhausted with the *condonatio peccatorum* (*Inst.* iii. 11). The same thing is done by the Protestant doctrinal theology before the *Formula Concordiæ*—which first expressly added the υἱοθεσία, which is really included therein." Compare, however, the Heidelberg Catechism, Question 60.† The beatitude from Ps. xxxii. 1 and 2 is quoted from the Septuagint. [See *Textual Note* ⁸] The choice of verbs in ver. 7 corresponds to the substantives. The ἀνομία is a debt doomed to prison; it is released, and thus abolished; the ἁμαρτία is the ground of it, and is covered from God's eye (כִּפֵּר. כָּסָה)—that is, abolished by Him.

Second Paragraph (vers. 9–12).

Justification applies also to the Gentiles. It is a justification for all.

Ver. 9. **(Is) this blessedness** [ὁ μακαρισμός, *the pronouncing happy, congratulation, Seligpreisung*], **then, upon the circumcision.** The question now is, whether the beatitude described by David applies only to the Jews. The expositors have supplied different words: Tholuck [Stuart, Philippi, Meyer, ed. 4.], and others, ἐστί; Meyer* [Fritzsche, De Wette, Alford, Hodge], λέγεται [comp. Heb. vii. 13; Mark ix. 12], with reference to ver. 6 (others, πίπτει [Theophylact], ἦλθεν [Œcumenius], ἔρχεται [Olshausen], γέγονε). The λέγεται has less foundation than ἐστί. [It is always safer to supply the simplest word.—P. S.]—**Or also upon the uncircumcision?** The *also* shows that the previous clause is to be understood in the exclusive sense: upon the circumcision *only*. [Some MSS. add μόνον.—P. S.]—**For we say.** The γάρ presupposes that the Apostle has already mentally expected an affirmative reply to the question, Or upon the uncircumcision also? [The form of the question, too, with ἢ καί, presupposes an affirmative answer to the second clause, and this implied affirmation is made the ground of the argumentation, vers. 10–12. De Wette and Alford.—P. S.] The τῷ Ἀβρ. is certainly emphatic, as Fritzsche, De Wette [Alford], and others, maintain, though Meyer denies it; for the whole of the following argument proceeds from the person of Abraham. [For we say that **to Abraham** faith was reckoned for righteousness.—P. S.]

Ver. 10. **Not in circumcision, but.** According to Gen. xv., Abraham was justified about fourteen years before his circumcision, Gen. xvii. [Consequently his circumcision was not the effective cause and condition, but the Divine ratification of grace already received.—P. S.]

Ver. 11. **And he received a sign of circumcision** [καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβεν περιτομῆς†]. Genitive of apposition [*i. e.*, a sign which consisted in circumcision. Van Hengel and Hofmann, preferring the reading περιτομήν to περιτομῆς, explain: As a sign he received circumcision, as a seal (σφραγῖδα in apposition to σημεῖον). Meyer objects that

* According to Reiche, Abraham is the μὴ ἐργαζόμενος, the ἀσεβής; and this word alludes to the early idolatry of Abraham, which is described by Philo, Josephus, and Maimonides. Grotius, and others, have adopted the same opinion.

† [This question of the Heidelberg Catechism, which was first published in 1563, contains one of the best statements of the evangelical doctrine of justification, and clearly brings out the positive element, which Tholuck wrongly dates from the Form of Concord of the year 1577. It reads thus: "How art thou righteous before God? Answer: Only by true faith in Jesus Christ. That is: although my conscience accuse me, that I have grievously sinned against all the commandments of God, and have never kept any of them, and that I am still prone always to all evil, yet God, without any merit of mine, of mere grace, *grants and imputes to me the perfect satisfaction, righteousness, and holiness of Christ*, as if I had never committed nor had any sin, and had myself accomplished all the obedience which Christ has fulfilled for me, if only I accept such benefit with a believing heart."—P. S.]

* [This must refer to a former edition; for, in the 4th ed. of 1865, Meyer gives the preference to ἐστί: "*Als das sich von selbst verstehende Verbum wird am einfachsten* ἐστί *gedacht* (*vergl.* ii. 9, Acts iv. 33, *al.*); *weniger naheliegend ist* λέγεται *aus* v. 6."—P. S.]

† [The order of the words is simply rhetorical and euphonic, and gives no emphasis to σημεῖον. See Tholuck and Philippi.—P. S.]

in the first case, σημεῖον, in the second, περιτομήν, ought to have the article, and explains: *Ein Zeichen mit welchem er durch die Beschneidung versehen ward, empfing er als Siegel*—*i. e.*, a sign, with which he was provided in circumcision, he received as seal. But the article is sometimes omitted where the reference is specific, and where there is no danger of mistake; comp. Winer, p. 118 f. **σημεῖον**, sign, token, symbol, אוֹת. Circumcision was the sign of the covenant God made with Abraham, Gen. xvii. 11; God, on His part, promising the Messianic κληρονομία (Gen. xv. 5, 18), and Abraham, on his part, exercising the obedience of faith which was reckoned to him for righteousness (Gen. xv. 6). Hence Paul represents it as a seal of the righteousness of faith. This was not only a "legitimate dogmatic inference" (Meyer), but, as Tholuck remarks, a historical necessity, since the *sign* of the covenant was granted in consequence of the faith previously shown.—P. S.]—**The seal.** The seal denotes here the symbolical and sacramental sealing; from this, the real sealing of Abraham, which was given him after the offering of Isaac, Gen. xxii. 1, is still to be distinguished (see the *Biblework on Genesis* xxii.). "It is also represented in the Talmud as the sign and seal of the covenant. See Schöttgen and Wetstein *in loc.* These words belonged to the formula of circumcision: '*Benedictus sit, qui sanctificavit dilectum ab utero, et signum* (אוֹת) *posuit in carne, et filios suos sigillavit* (חָתַם) *signo fœderis sancti;*' *Beracoth*, f. xiii. 1." Meyer [foot-note]. Christian writers [*Acta Thomæ*, § 26; Grabe, *Spicileg. Patr.* I., p. 338] speak in the same way of the water of baptism as a seal [ἡ σφραγὶς τοῦ λουτροῦ. A seal here means a mark of Divine ratification of a justification already received, a "signaculum rei *actæ*," not a "pignus rei *agendæ*;" comp. 1 Cor. ix. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 19. We have here an intimation of the true idea of sacraments: they are signs, seals, and means of grace, but not the grace itself. Circumcision is not the covenant, neither is baptism regeneration. A sign and seal can never be the substitute for the thing signed and sealed, nor should it be made a ground of confidence and hope; but it is all-important as a Divine ratification, and gives, so to say, legal validity to our claims, as the governmental seal to a written instrument. Without the seal of circumcision, Abraham would have had no certain guarantee of the Divine favor; and if justification by faith is abstractly separated from the church and the means of grace, it becomes a subjective fiction of man.—P. S.]—**That he might be the father.** The spiritual father is meant here. Abraham is the father of faith. "The conception of author, founder, is also contained in that of father; comp. Job. xxxviii. 28; Gen. iv. 21; 1 Macc. ii. 54;" Tholuck.—On the idea of Abraham's spiritual children, see Matt. iii. 9; John viii. 37, 38. Gal. iii. 8, 29, is a parallel.—**That righteousness might be reckoned also to them.** This means the sense in which Abraham, as a believing Gentile, has become the father of believing Gentiles.

Ver. 12. **And the father of circumcision.** Prominence is here given to the life of faith, the proof of faith, in connection with circumcision for faith. We remark on the language: 1. εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτόν must be mentally repeated after καί. 2. τοῖς, the *dative commodi* [*for those*], comes in the place of faith. 3. Instead of ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσι, we should expect ἀλλὰ καὶ στοιχοῦσι without the article. Tholuck: "The καὶ τοῖς is an unexampled solecism in the Apostle's language." Theodoret, Hervæus, Luther, and others, have assumed a transposition: τοῖς οὐκ, instead of οὐ τοῖς. Meyer and Tholuck reject this. Rückert defends the supposition of a transposition; Fritzsche excuses the article; Reiche defends it [so does Stuart; both regard it as a resumption of the sentence begun with the preceding τοῖς, and interrupted by the οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καί.—P. S.] It may be asked whether οἱ οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ στοιχοῦντες could be said. And this would certainly be practicable, if we could place ὄντες after μόνον. They are not only *the* people of the circumcision, but also those who walk, &c. The faith of the real Jews is not only here made prominent, but also their life of faith; no doubt with reference to the fact that these believing Jews, like Abraham, should be the humane publishers of salvation to the Gentiles. [τοῖς ἴχνεσι, the dative after στοιχεῖν is not local, but normative; comp. Gal. v. 16, 25; vi. 16; Phil. iii. 16; Meyer.—P. S.]

Third Paragraph (Vers. 13–17).

Ver. 13. **For not through (the) law is the promise to Abraham, or to his seed, that he should be the heir of the world.** (See Gal. iii.) Ver. 13 does not simply establish the preceding (Meyer), since that is established of itself. The foregoing statement is indeed strengthened by the discussion which now follows (therefore: *for*); but the latter also sets forth a new privilege of the righteousness of faith, namely, its release from the law. See De Wette.—**Not through the law.** The law declared only the possession of Canaan by the Jews; but the promise which Abraham received pledged to him and his believing children the whole earth as an inheritance.—*Through the law;* that is, not *per justitiam legis* (Pareus, and others), but with the Mosaic legislation. [De Wette and Alford: "διὰ νόμου, not, '*under the law*,' nor, '*by works of the law*,' nor, '*by the righteousness of the law;*' but, **through the law**, so that the law should be the *ground*, or *efficient cause*, or *medium*, of the promise."—P. S.]—**The promise** (*sc.* ἐστί) **to Abraham, or to his seed.** This is the great Messianic ἐπαγγελία κατ' ἐξοχήν. The ἤ, *or*, expresses the indivisibility of the promise to Abraham and his seed—that is, his believing seed (Gal. iii. 9)—and cannot be replaced by καί, or be divided thus: neither to Abraham nor his seed (Meyer). Abraham inherits with his seed, and his seed inherits with Abraham (see Matt. viii. 11; Heb. xi.). According to Estius, Olshausen, and others, the seed is *Christ*, conformably to Gal. iii. 16. Meyer says: "Not Christ;" which is just as incorrect as the limitation of the seed to Christ.—**That he should be the heir of the world** [τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι κόσμου]. The τό introduces an explanatory declaration of the import of the promise. The αὐτός refers to Abraham, because he, in his person, represents also his seed. "In the promises, Gen. xiii. 15; xvii. 8; xxii. 17, 18, the blessing bestowed on Abraham in chap. xii. is expressly transferred to his seed;" Tholuck. It may be asked now, Where has this promise of the possession of the world been given to Abraham? The promises which the Old Testament furnishes in reference to the hereditary

possession of Abraham seem to include only the land of Canaan; Gen. xii. 7: "Unto thy seed will I give this land" (Canaan); chap. xiii. 14, 15: "Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever;" chap. xv. 18: "From the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates;" chap. xvii. 8: "All the land of Canaan;" chap. xxii. 17: "Thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies" (comp. chap. xxvi. 3, the repetition of the promise to Isaac; and Exod. vi. 4, the legal establishment). In all these there is no promise of the inheritance of the *world*. It is not correct to consider *κόσμος* and *γῆ* as identical. Thus Meyer says: "The hereditary possession of the land of Canaan, which was promised to Abraham and his posterity (Gen. xii. 7, &c.), was regarded in the Jewish christology as *the government of the world by the Messianic theocracy*, which was supposed to be typically indicated in Gen. xxii. '*Abrahamo patri meo Deus possidendum dedit* CŒLUM ET TERRAM;' *Tanchuma*, p. 163, 1; see also Wetstein. The idea of the *Messianic sovereignty of the world*, which underlies this Jewish particularistic view, is *not* set aside in the New Testament, but it is brought out by Christ Himself (Matt. v. 5) in allegorical form (Matt. xix. 28 ff.; Luke xxii. 30; Matt. xxv. 21), divested of its Judaistic notion, and elevated to christological truth. It is necessary, because of the universal sovereignty to which Christ Himself is exalted (Matt. xxviii. 18; John xvii. 5; Phil. ii. 9; Eph. iv. 10, &c.); and because of the necessary communion between His disciples and Himself." But we can hardly suppose that the Apostle would here apply *against* the Jews the promise of the land of Canaan *to* the Jews, in its higher signification. We must keep in view the significant passage, Gen. xxii. 17, 18: "Blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemy. And *in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*." Here we have the germ of the same promise (Origen, Chrysostom, Bengel, and others). Superiority is declared by the very position of the one who blesses, and the earth itself is meant by the nations of the earth. Tholuck remarks, on the contrary, that by *κόσμος* we must then understand the *σπέρμα* itself, so far as it is led to faith, and that this cannot be regarded at once as *κληρονόμος* and *κληρονομία*. But the *σπέρμα*, as the organ of the world's conversion, must be distinguished from the *σπέρμα*, as the converted world. God is the inheritance of believers, as believers are the inheritance of God. De Wette, in summing up the different explanations, says: "*ἡ κληρονομία τοῦ κόσμου* is not an indefinite allegorical blessedness (Flatt); not the reception of all nations into the theocracy (Melanchthon, Beza, Bengel, Chrysostom, Theodoret, &c.); not the possession of Canaan and some adjacent countries, '*quæ felicitas arcanam gerebat imaginem æternæ felicitatis*' (Grotius); nor of the earth (Rosenmüller, Koppe, Köllner, Rückert), in the sense of the political sovereignty of the world; nor is it a possession of the future world (Calov.*); still less of the *beneficia spiritualia* (Bald.), or *sub typo terræ Canaan non modo spes cœlestis vitæ, sed plena et solida Dei benedictio* (Calvin); but it is the dominion over the world, which, with all its opposing forces, shall be subjected to Christ and the Christians (Reiche, Meyer, Fritzsche)." Obviously too many negations!—We must bear in mind, that in the Messianic promise given to Abraham, the struggle and the dominion are indicated only finally; the chief idea is the blessing. If all the nations of the earth were to be really blessed by Abraham's seed, then his seed must be able to dispose of a world of blessing. [The promise will be literally fulfilled when the kingdoms of the world are given to the people of the Most High, and Christ will rule with His saints forever and ever; Dan. vii. 27; Apoc. xi. 15; xii. 10; Matt. v. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 12.—P. S.]—**By the righteousness of faith.** This was the fundamental gift by which the promise of the world was conditioned. Meyer thinks that, because of the date of the justification, Gen. xv [*i. e., after* the promise had been given; Gen. xii. 3, 7; xiii. 15, 16.—P. S.], Paul must have here in mind only later passages [xv. 18; xvii. 8, where the promise is repeated.—P. S.]. But, according to Gen. xii., Abraham's life of faith had begun at the time of his emigration. [The faith of Abraham covered the whole period of the promise, which was made and repeatedly confirmed to his faith.—P. S.]

Ver. 14. **For if they who are of the law.** Proof that Abraham's believing children, but not they who, in contrast with them, rely on the law and its deeds, shall inherit the world. The *νόμος*, according to Flatt, the moral law; according to Meyer, the Mosaic law; both, according to Tholuck. The Apostle is certainly not concerned here exclusively with the idea of the Mosaic *νόμος*, as such, but rather with the idea of the legal standpoint, or of the law, considered abstractly in itself, and in contrast with the promise. And it may be said of the natural moral law, too, that it worketh wrath. *Οἱ ἐκ νόμου* are not people who are still under the law as such, but whose life-principle is the law, and who wish to be justified by the law. [*οἱ ἐκ νόμου*, those of law = adherents of the law, legalists. This periphrase is of frequent occurrence; comp. *οἱ ἐξ ἐριθείας*, those of self-seeking = self-seeking partisans; ii. 8; *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*, the circumcised; iv. 12; Tit. i. 10; Acts x. 45; xi. 2; *οἱ ἐκ πίστεως*, the believers; Gal. iii. 7, 9; Rom iv. 16; *οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ*, the Israelites; Rom. ix. 6, &c.; comp. Xenoph., *Anab.* i. 2, 18, *οἱ ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς*, the market people. The preposition *ἐκ* (*out of*) indicates here the origin and character.—P. S.]—**Be heirs, faith is made void.** At the time when this decisive word was uttered, it had not only a great spiritual, but also a great prophetical meaning. Judging from external signs, it was more probable that the Jews, rather than the Christians, would inherit the earth. They had a powerful prominence, wide dissemination, and synagogues all over the world. But the Apostle was sure of his cause, and wished clearly to distinguish the future of faith from the future of that darkened legalism. Yet his thought is not: if the legalists are heirs, believers cannot be; but, if the legalists are heirs, there will be no inheritance of the promise at all. **Faith is** made void—that is, it loses its import, the righteousness of faith—by wrath in the conscience; the promise is made powerless by the wrath of historical judgments, because it was only intended for faith

Ver. 15. **Because the law worketh wrath**

* [By a typographical mistake, the original, in the second as well as the first edition, reads *Calvin*, instead of *Calovius*, who was a fierce Lutheran polemic of the seventeenth century, and author of the *Biblia illustrata*, in refutation of the commentaries of Grotius.—P. S.]

The operation of the law is to reveal sin and to represent it as transgression, as well in the conscience as in the life itself. Therefore it produces wrath, which, according to the Divine sentence and government, bursts forth from the internal and external life as the severe judgment of dissolution and of death. **For where there is no law, neither is there transgression** (of the law); and where there is no transgression, there is no wrath. But inversely, the law fully reveals transgression, and, with transgression, wrath and condemnation to death. The proof that the law worketh wrath, is therefore negative. This operation is meant to apply first of all to the Mosaic law, as is proved by Rom. v. 13, 14, particularly by the distinction between ἁμαρτία and παράβασις (see 1 Tim. ii. 14; Gal. iii. 19). Tholuck quotes Augustine: "*Sine lege potest esse quis iniquus, sed non prævaricator,*" and says that "this difference has generally been observed ever since. But where it has not been observed, such παρερμηνεῖαι have arisen, as with Luther (on Gal. iii. 19), who introduces, from chap. vii. 5; v. 20, the thought that the lust of sin is dormant without the law." Tholuck also properly remarks, that the axiom of chap. v. 13, ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου, can be understood only relatively of a less quantity of guilt, as is proved by the judgment of the Deluge, and other judgments. He quotes Thomas Aquinas: "*Et tamen omne peccatum potest dici prævaricatio, in quantum legem naturalem transgreditur.*" [But Thomas adds: "*Gravius tamen est transgredi simul legem naturalem et legem scriptam, quam solam legem naturæ. Et ideo lege data crevit prævaricatio et majorem iram promeruit.*"] Yet the ἐλλογεῖται of chap. v. 13 is to be emphasized so as to denote God's real reckoning with the sinner by His law, which first causes the natural punishment of the sinner to assume the clear blaze of wrath. Man can obtain salvation only by this passage through the judgment of death. For this reason the Apostle does not deny the necessity of the law; but with him it is a means for an end, and constitutes the pedagogic point of transition for the pious under the law (ὑπὸ νόμον, chap. vi. 14, 15). But people of the law (οἱ ἐκ νόμου), who seek justification ἐξ ἔργων (chap. iv. 2) because they are in feeling ἐξ ἐριθείας (chap. ii. 8), make the means an end. They seek their life in the single precepts and observance of the law, in pride in the possession of the law, and in the settlement of their account with God; and by this course they find their existence in the fire of wrath, but, unlike the salamander, they find no comfort in the fire. They do not make the law their preparation for faith, but the antithesis of faith; and they endeavor, by the fire of their fanaticism, to entice from a joyous and bright life those who are happy in faith, and to draw them into their own gloomy heat. For other explanations of ὀργή, see Tholuck. Cocceius: The ceremonial law is the emanation of wrath; J. Müller: ὀργή must be understood subjectively—the consciousness of wrath; Melanchthon: The ὀργή is the sinner's wrath toward the avenging God.

Ver. 16. **Therefore it is of faith.** The inference from vers. 14, 15. That cannot be; therefore this must stand true. Ἐκ πίστεως. Supply: ἡ κληρονομία γίνεται (Beza, Bengel); ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῷ Ἀβρ. ἐστι καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ (Grotius, Fritzsche, Tholuck in earlier editions, and others); δικαιοσύνη (Luther); or, better, οἱ κληρονόμοι εἰσί (Meyer. De Wette, and Tholuck, referring to ver. 14, where ἐκ πίστεως and ἐκ νόμου appear as antitheses). This last seems the most appropriate; yet in ver. 14 we read not οἱ κληρονόμοι, but οἱ ἐκ νόμου—κληρονόμοι; and further on it is οἱ ἐκ πίστεως. Therefore, we must merely supply either κληρονόμοι or ἔστω.—**That it might be by grace.** Faith is here plainly denoted the homogeneous organ of grace. It is grace, and not man's faith, that is the source of that general surety of God's promise; but grace makes faith the organ, just as wrath manifests itself in the work of the law. ἵνα denotes here the consistency of the principle *of faith*, which certainly rests upon a Divine determination. Tholuck supplies φῶσιν.

In order that the promise might be sure to all the seed [εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν παντὶ τῷ σπέρματι]. The εἰς denotes the result designed by God—that the promise of His grace be communicated to faith. By this determination the fact is secured, that the promise holds good for his collective seed—that is, for his entire spiritual posterity.—**Not to that only which is of the law,** &c. The τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου denotes here the historical origin of the whole body of faithful Jews. The τῷ ἐκ πίστεως, as antithesis, denotes the faithful Gentiles. They form a totality by which Abraham is the father of all (see vers. 11, 12).

Ver. 17. **As it is written.** Gen. xvii. 5; where a natural posterity of many nations is promised to Abraham in relation to his name.* Yet this promise has its ground in his faith (vers. 18, 19), and hence Paul very properly regarded it as the type of his *spiritual* posterity. The spiritual relation is also implied in the Divine appointment, τέθεικά σε.—[It was] **in the sight of him whom he believed** [κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσεν θεοῦ†]. On account of the connection with what has preceded, the difficult word κατέναντι must be here explained [as far as the construction is concerned]. 1. Luther follows the reading ἐπίστευσας [before God, whom *thou hast believed*] of the Codd. F. G., It., and others, and finds here a continuation of God's words. An attempt to explain the connection. 2. Bretschneider: "in view of which word," οὗ *sc.* εἰρημένου. 3. Meyer, Tholuck [Alford, Hodge], and others: The quotation, καθὼς—σε, is parenthetical [so also in the E. V.], and κατέναντι must be connected with ὅς ἐστι πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν [*i. e.*, Abraham is the father of us all, not physically, but spiritually, *in the sight and estimation of God*, with whom there are no obstacles of nature or time.—P. S.] Meyer [and also Winer, *Gramm.*, p. 156, 7th ed.] thus resolves the attraction: κατέναντι τοῦ θεοῦ, κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσε [*i. e., before God, before whom*, or, *in whose sight he believed*], according to the analogous attraction of Luke i. 4; and rejects the more common resolution [adopted also by Fritzsche] of the attraction κατέναντι θεοῦ, ᾧ ἐπίστευσε [*before God, whom he believed*—a form of attraction with the dative, which is very unusual; see Winer, p. 156, and Meyer *in loc.*—P. S.]. See Meyer, for other attempts at construction. But what are we to

* [Abraham, אַבְרָהָם = אַב הֲמוֹן גּוֹיִם, *father of a multitude*, the new significant name given to *Abram* אַבְרָם, *i. e., father of elevation, high father*, Gen. xvii. 5; xviii. 18.—P. S.]

† [Lange makes a period after the quotation from Gen. xvii. 5, and then translates: *Angesichts* [*war's*] *des Gottes, dem er Glauben hielt.* He supplies ἐγένετο, and commences here a new paragraph. See his interpretation below.—P. S.]

understand by the expression: he is the father of us all before God? The idea of a substitution by Abraham, which might easily be inferred from the language, would be foreign to the Apostle. 4. We supply ἐγένετο [before κατέναντι], and explain thus: As it is written, "I have made thee a father of many nations;" it took place in the presence of God, or, it came to pass there, in the place where he stood believing before God, that he was made the father of many nations; before Him, namely, God, &c. He who is justified, who receives God's promise, stands before God. [Philippi, without parenthesizing καθὼς—σε, supplies after this quotation: And as such—viz., as father of nations—he stands in the sight of God, &c.—P. S.]

Fourth Paragraph (vers. 17–25).

A.—*Abraham's Faith* (*vers.* 17–22).

Ver. 17. **Before him whom he believed, even God.** Explanations of *coram* [κατέναντι, literally, *down over against*, *opposite to*, like the classical κατεναντίον; then = κατενώπιον, *coram*, so here, and often in the LXX., for לִפְנֵי—P. S.]: 1. According to the will (Reiche). 2. According to the decision (Rückert, and others). 3. *Vi atque potestate divina* (Koppe). 4. Before God's omniscience (Olshausen). 5. Meyer [p. 173, footnote]: "We must leave it without explanation. Abraham is *represented* as standing before God who *has appeared* to him." But it denotes the first element of the Abrahamic faith. Abraham, as the friend of God, stands in the view of the living God of revelation, the speaking God, who is at the same time the God of miracles and new creations; and it is while Abraham is there, that he is appointed the father of many nations. (Theodoret, Theophylact, and others, have explained κατέναντι as equal to ὁμοίως τῷ θεῷ; Grotius has divided the sentence into question and answer; see Meyer).—Κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσεν, standing before Him, he believed the promise on the spot.

Who quickeneth the dead. [The present tense ζωοποιοῦντος and καλοῦντος is used to indicate the continued manifestation of God's creative power in every physical and in every spiritual birth.—P. S.] "The ζωοποιεῖν τοὺς νεκρούς is the solemn characteristic of the omnipotent God," says Meyer. The doctrine of the omnipotence of God, as the wonder-working power of the God of revelation, has been directed from the beginning to the consummation of the revelation in the resurrection of Christ, and subsequently to the special and general resurrection (Eph. i. 19 ff.). This is evident from those passages of the Old Testament which represent the wonder-working power of God as a power to bring the dead to life, produced by it (Deut. xxxii. 39; 1 Sam. ii. 6; Isa. xxvi. 19; liii. 10; Ezek. xxxvii. 1 ff.; Hosea xiii. 14; Dan. xii. 1, 2; comp. Book of Wisdom, xvi. 13; Tobit xiii. 2; John v. 21; 2 Cor. i. 9; 1 Tim. vi. 13). The Apostle, with profound penetration, sees this miraculous power which raises the dead to life, foreshadowed already in the promise of Isaac. For he does not have in view the offering of Isaac (according to Erasmus, Grotius, Baumgarten-Crusius), although the stronger expression seems to have been selected also with reference to that last believing act of Abraham. Neither is the awakening of the spiritually dead chiefly meant (according to Origen, Anselm and others). Nevertheless, we would not, with Meyer, altogether reject these explanations as *false*; for the external awakenings stand in the most intimate reciprocal relation with the internal. In fact, the former are generally conditioned by the latter; as we see that Abraham had to believe first in the promise given to him.

And calleth those things, which are not, as though they were [literally, **calling things not being, as being,** καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα. Τὰ μὴ ὄντα differs from τὰ οὐκ ὄντα in that it presents the non-existence as conditional: *if* they are not; or as relative only, inasmuch as all things preëxist ideally and subjectively in the Divine mind before they are created and set forth objectively.—P. S.]. Two explanations:* 1. Reference to the creative agency of God (Tholuck, and most expositors). Καλεῖν often denotes God's creative call, *to summon into being*, *into existence* (Isa. xli. 4; xlviii. 13; 2 Kings viii. 1; Book of Wisdom, xi. 25; comp. Ps. xxxiii. 9). Philo [*De creat. princ.*, p. 728 B.]: τὰ μὴ ὄντα ἐκάλεσεν εἰς τὸ εἶναι. This explanation admits of several modifications: *a*. The first creative act is thought of (Estius). *b*. God's continued creation is in mind (Köllner; reference to the *particip. præs.*). *c*. A constant attribute of God is denoted (Tholuck). Meyer holds that this whole interpretation is destroyed by the ὡς ὄντα; for, in the New Testament, ὡς is nowhere the same as εἰς. Yet Tholuck adduces proof in favor of the signification εἰς τὸ εἶναι ὡς ὄντα. [He refers to 1 Cor. i. 8; 2 Cor. iii. 6; 1 Thess. v. 23; Jude 24. Comp. Phil. iii. 21, where the accusative σύμμορφον, *like unto his glorious body*, is the accusative of effect = *so as to be like*.—P. S.] De Wette: ὡς ὄντα can indeed not be a substitute for εἰς ὄντα = εἰς τὸ εἶναι, but it can be a substitute for ὡς ἐσόμενα, or for εἰς τὸ εἶναι ὡς ὄντα (Reiche, and others). 2. Meyer, and others (Rückert, Philippi): *Who pronounces his enacting command over what does not exist, as over what does exist*.† It is not necessary to prove that, even in reference to the creation, this is the full sense (see Heb. xi. 3); the ideal preëxistence of things in the mind of God is therewith intimated. Nevertheless, the idea of the καλεῖν—to call into existence, or into appearance—must be retained. Meyer holds that the things which are not, that God called into existence, are, according to Gen. xv., the posterity

* [Or three, rather; but the third, which refers καλεῖν to the effectual calling of unborn men by the Holy Spirit, and explains: "God calls to be His children those who were not children," is entirely foreign to the context. It is strange that even the rationalistic Fritzsche explains: "*homines nondum in lucem editos tamquam editos ad vitam æternam invitat*." The ἐκλογή and πρόγνωσις of God precedes the birth, but the κλῆσις only refers to living men.—P. S.]

† [Tholuck doubts that καλεῖν, קָרָא, ever means, to command, to dispose of; but comp. Ps. l. 1; Isa. xl. 26; xlv. 3; xlviii. 3. Meyer and Philippi quote two striking parallel passages from Philo, *De Jos.*, p. 544, C., where he speaks of the imagination as forming τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα, and Artemidor, i. 53, where it is said of the painter that he represents τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα. To these quotations I may add the famous lines of Shakespeare on the creative power of the poet's genius (*Midsummer-Night's Dream*, Act v. Scene 1):

"The poet's eye, in a fine frenzy rolling,
Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven
And, as imagination bodies forth
The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen
Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing
A local habitation and a name."—P. S.]

of Abraham. But Abraham's faith undoubtedly presupposed earlier deeds of omnipotence. The elements of God's creative power, and of His renewing power, are comprehended together in the conception of His miraculous power. The creative word is a symbol and pledge of every new creative word which is spoken subsequently.

Ver. 18. **Who against hope believed in hope** [ὅς παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν]. Faith in miracles, which is itself a miracle, corresponds to the gracious God who worketh miracles. Established on the ground of hope, he believed against the appearance of hope. Meyer solves the oxymoron incorrectly: Abraham's faith was *against hope* in an *objective* relation, and yet it was established on hope in a *subjective* relation. Tholuck's view is better: His faith is a "Yea" established on the word of God, in opposition to the "No" in the sphere of finite causes. Ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, 1 Cor. ix. 10. [ἐπ' ἐλπίδι is not adverbial = *confidently*, but ἐπί signifies the subjective ground of his faith. Faith is the organ of the supernatural, and holds fast to the Invisible as if it saw Him. Hope is faith itself, as directed to the future.—P. S.].

That he might become. Three explanations of εἰς: 1. Of the result—so that he might become (Flatt, Fritzsche, and others). 2. He believed that he should be. That is, εἰς τὸ γεν. is the object of ἐπιστ. (Beza, Reiche, and others). 3. It contains the purpose of the ἐπιστ. ordained by God (Meyer, and others). This is favored by the following κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον. [So also Alford, Hodge: He believed, in order that, agreeably to the purpose of God, he might become the father of many nations.]—**According to that which was spoken.** See, in Gen. xv. 5, the reference to the stars of heaven. Codd. F. and G. insert the comparison: as the stars of heaven, and as the sand upon the sea-shore (the latter from Gen. xxii. 17).

Ver. 19. **And being not weak in faith.** A meiosis [μείωσις, diminution], according to Theophylact and Beza [*i. e.*, the negative form for the positive: *being strong*. So also Tholuck and Meyer.] The sense is rather that, in the long trial, his faith did not grow weary, but stronger, in spite of the difficulties in his path.—**He considered** [not, οὐ], κατενοήσεν. Tholuck says: "The omission of the οὐ in important MSS., such as A. C. [to which must be added Cod. Sin. and B.—P. S.], the Syriac Version, and others, was occasioned by having regard to Gen. xvii. 17, where Abraham does certainly reflect upon finite causes. For this reason the sense was thought to be, that he reflected without being weak in faith. But Paul had in view only Gen. xv. 5, 6, according to which Abraham accepted the promise at once without hesitation." [So also Meyer.] But Paul means plainly a steadfast faith, which became more vigorous by the trial of many years of waiting, and whose strength was augmented by the temptations occurring in the meantime.*—**His own body now dead.** Abraham was more than ninety-nine years old when the promise was fulfilled (after the circumcision, Gen. xvii. 24), and Sarah was more than ninety years old. The terms νενεκρωμένον and νέκρωσις, in reference to generative death (Heb. xi. 12), must not be taken absolutely, but be considered according to the measure of experience and the usual course of nature. Bengel: "*Post Semum* (*Shem*) *nemo centum annorum generasse Gen.* xi. *legitur.*" [The difficulty concerning the later children of Abraham and Keturah, Gen. xxv. 1, 2, Augustin (*De civit. Dei*, xvi. 28) and Bengel removed, by assuming that the generative power miraculously conferred upon Abraham continued to his death. Bengel: *Novus corporis vigor etiam mansit in matrimonio cum Ketura.* So also Philippi and Meyer.—P. S.]

Ver. 20. **He staggered not at the promise of God.** The δέ, which is an expression of antithesis, appears at first sight to favor κατενόησε, the reading of the Codd. A. C., instead of οὐ κατενόησε. But it constitutes another antithesis. Ver. 19 says, that he continued steadfast in faith, in spite of the contradiction of sensuous experience; that he did not regard natural appearance. Ver. 20, on the contrary, expresses the idea: Neither was he doubtful by unbelief concerning the promise itself. For unbelief is not produced merely by reflecting doubtfully on the contradiction of sensuous experience, but also by an immediate want of confidence in the miraculous promise itself which belongs to the sphere of invisible life. He was not only not weak in faith in his disregard of sensuous improbability, but, while looking at the promise, he grew even stronger in faith; for he overcame the temptation of a subtle misinterpretation of the promise. According to Meyer, the δέ is only explanatory; but Tholuck, and most expositors, regard it as expressing an antithesis. According to Rückert, the article in τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ denotes the unbelief common to man; but it denotes unbelief as such, whose nature is to doubt the promise of God. Therefore other explanations are superfluous (Meyer: in consequence of the unbelief which he would have had in this case).* The passive form, ἐνεδυναμώθη, arises from his undoubting aim toward the promise. The promise has the effect of always strengthening the faith of him who looks at it. Therefore Grotius disturbs the real meaning of the word, when he takes it in the middle voice, *he strengthened himself*. Even the intransitive meaning which Tholuck accepts, "to grow strong," fails in the same way to satisfy the relation between the promise and the steadfast gaze of faith.

Ver. 20. **Giving glory to God.** To give God the glory (נָתַן כָּבוֹד לַיהוָה, or, שׂוּם); a mark of faith which God, as the revealed God, can demand. John ix. 24 was spoken hypocritically; John xii. 43 is indirectly expressed. Comp. also Luke xvii. 18, 19; Rom. i. 21; 1 John v. 10; Rev. xix. 7; comp. Philippi and Meyer on this passage, both of whom amplify the meaning. Tholuck says better: "Then unbelief is a robbery of God's glory. It does not easily occur except in a state of trial (?), but it does so occur in such a state. Therefore Calvin says: '*Extra certamen quidem nemo Deum omnia posse negat; verum simulac objicitur aliquid,*

* [Stuart, Hodge, and Wordsworth take no notice of this important difference of reading. Alford brackets οὐ, but prefers it as being better suited to the context; the object being to extol Abraham's faith. Omitting οὐ, the sense will be: "And not being weak in the faith, he was indeed well aware of," &c., "but (δέ) did not stagger at the promise," &c.; or, "although he was aware of," &c., "yet did he not." This agrees better with δέ in ver. 20; but we miss in this case μέν after κατενόησε. The dogmatic idea of the passage is well brought out by Calvin, who is followed by Philippi and Hodge. A similar obstruction of faith, as the one recorded of Abraham, Gen. xvii. 17, occurred in the life of John the Baptist; Matt. xi. 2 ff.—P. S.]

* [Meyer and Philippi take τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ as an instrumental dative; τῇ πίστει as a dative of reference: "*Er schwankte nicht* VERMÖGE DES UNGLAUBENS (*den er in diesem Falle gehabt haben würde*), *sondern wurde stark* AM GLAUBEN (*den er hatte*).—P. S.]

quod cursum promissionum Dei impediat, Dei virtutem e suo gradu dejicimus.'"

Ver. 21. **And being fully persuaded.** According to Lachmann (contrary to Tischendorf), the καί before πληροφορηθείς is strongly attested by the Codd. A. B. C., &c. If the καί is omitted, we have here the reason for the fact that he gave God the glory. With the καί, the words suitably explain the manner in which he gave God the glory; for he was fully convinced that He was the El Shaddai, and that, by virtue of His omnipotence, He was able to fulfil what He in His truthfulness had promised. It was by this confident looking at the El Shaddai's word of promise that he was made strong ("heroic;" Meyer) in faith. The πληροφ. denotes intellectual activity, knowledge in living faith.*

Ver. 22. **Wherefore also it was reckoned to him as righteousness.** We must retain καί, as authorized by the Codd. A. C. [ℵ.], and others. But we must not overlook the fact that we have here a justification of justification in its essential adaptation. The διδόναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ in faith is a return to the paradisaical or angelic (Isa. vi. 3) attitude to God (Rom. i. 21). Since man gives God the glory, he again participates in the δόξα θεοῦ which he had lost as a sinner (Rom. iii. 23). In justification, believers embrace in their hearts the righteousness of Christ as the principle of the δόξα (Rom. viii. 30; comp. ver. 18). Therefore the spirit of δόξα rests upon them (1 Peter iv. 14) until the revelation of the δόξα of the Lord (1 Peter iv. 13).

B.—*The Faith of Christians* (*vers.* 23–25).

[Application of the Scripture testimony of Abraham, the father of the faithful, to the believers in Christ. His method of justification is our method of justification. Calvin: "*Abrahæ persona specimen communis justitiæ, quæ ad omnes spectat.*" This completes the argument for the vindication of the law through faith; iii. 31.—P. S.]

Ver. 23. **Now it was not written for his sake alone.** Explanations: 1. Not to his praise, *non in ipsius gloriam* (Beza, Tholuck). 2. To explain the manner of his justification (Meyer). The sense is this: not only for the purpose of a historical appreciation of Abraham (Rom. xv. 4; 1 Cor. x. 11; Gal. iii. 8), but also to represent him as the type of believers. In the same way the entire Bible has a universal destination for the believers of all times. Meyer quotes *Beresh R.* 40. 8: *Quidquid scriptum est de Abrahamo, scriptum est de filiis ejus.* [The aorist ἐγράφη, *it was written*, denotes the past historical act of writing, and is used here in order to emphasize the *design* of God's Spirit at the time of composition; while the more usual perf. γέγραπται, *it is written*, is used in quotations of Scripture passages as we now find them, and as valid for present purposes. Comp. Philippi.—P. S.]

Ver. 24. **But for us also, to whom it** [viz., the faith in God, or Christ, τὸ πιστεύειν τῷ θεῷ] **shall be reckoned** [supply: for righteousness, εἰς δικαιοσύνην, as ver. 22]. The μέλλει refers to the divine determination of Christianity as righteousness by faith in all time to come; but, contrary to Fritzsche, it does not refer to justification at the general judgment.

If we believe on him who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead. [τοῖς πιστεύουσιν "specifies the ἡμᾶς: and the belief is not a mere historical, but a *fiducial* belief;" Alford.—P. S.] Christian faith is specifically a faith in the risen Christ, or also in the living God of resurrection who raised Him from the dead. It is in this its central point that the finished faith of the New Testament is perfectly in harmony with the central point of Abraham's faith. The germ and fruit of this faith are identical in substance, though they differ very much in form and development. The nearest formal analogy to Abraham's faith is the birth of Christ from the Virgin. The highest exhibition of omnipotence was at the same time the highest exhibition of grace. [Christ's resurrection was a triumph of God's almighty power, similar, though much higher, than the generation of Isaac from the dead body of Abraham; by faith in the miracle of the resurrection, the resurrection is spiritually repeated in us, as we become new creatures in Christ, and walk with Him in newness of life; comp. vi. 3; Eph. i. 19, 20; Col. iii. 1.—P. S.]

Ver. 25. **Who was delivered up, &c.** ["In these words the Apostle introduces the great subject of chaps. v.–viii., *Death*, as connected with *Sin*, and *Life* as connected with *Righteousness*;" Alford and Forbes. "Ver. 25 is a comprehensive statement of the gospel;" Hodge. The διά means in both clauses, *on account of*, *for the reason of*, but with this difference, that it is retrospective in the first, prospective in the second: διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα, because we had sinned, or, in order to secure the remission of our transgressions; διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν, not because we had been, but that we might be justified.* To the first διά we must supply: for the atonement, or, for the destruction of; to the second: for the procurement of. De Wette *zur Büssung—zur Bestätigung.* παρεδόθη, a frequent designation of the self-surrender of Christ to death; Isa. liii. 12; Rom. viii. 32; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. v. 25: παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. δικαίωσις, from δικαιόω, (only here and v. 18, in opposition to κατάκριμα,) *justification*, *i. e.*, the effective declaratory act of putting a man right with the law, or into the status of δικαιοσύνη, *righteousness*.—P. S.] The antithesis in ver. 25 [παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν—ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν, the negative ἄφεσις and the positive δικαίωσις] is difficult. Tholuck [p. 194]: "This separation, as also that in chap. x. 10, is generally taken as a rhetorical μερισ-

* [Dr. Hodge, after quoting from Calvin, makes the following excellent remarks on πληροφορηθείς: "It is a very great error for men to suppose that to doubt is an evidence of humility. On the contrary, to doubt God's promise, or His love, is to dishonor Him, because it is to question His word. Multitudes refuse to accept His grace, because they do not regard themselves as worthy, as though their worthiness were the ground on which that grace is offered. The thing to be believed, is, that God accepts the unworthy; that, for Christ's sake, He justifies the unjust. Many find it far harder to believe that God can love them, notwithstanding their sinfulness, than the hundred-years-old patriarch did to believe that he should be the father of many nations. Confidence in God's word, a full persuasion that He can do what seems to us impossible, is as necessary in the one case as in the other. The sinner honors God, in trusting His grace, as much as Abraham did, in trusting His power."—P. S.]

* [Bishop Horsley, as quoted by Alford and Wordsworth, takes διά, in the second clause, in the sense that Christ was raised because our justification had *already been effected* by the sacrifice of His death. But this is inconsistent with 1 Cor. xv. 17. Newman explains: because our justification is by the Second Comforter, whom the resurrection brought down from heaven."—P. S.]

ρός, separating that which is in substance indivisible. Yet, in the contemplation of the Apostle, the *δικαίωσις* certainly is more nearly related to the resurrection of Christ than to His death, as is shown by the climax of Rom. viii. 34, and by the *πολλῷ μᾶλλον* of chap. v. 10; comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 4." But the passages cited do not contain the same antithesis. According to Roman Catholic interpretation, *δικαίωσις* refers to sanctification (Thomas Aquinas, and others). The old Protestant explanation, on the contrary, referred the first clause to the destruction of sin, and the second to the ratification of the atonement secured thereby (Calvin). Meyer refers the first part to the expiation of our sins, and the second to our justification; with reference to 1 Cor. xv. 17. Tholuck distinguishes between the negative and positive abolition of guilt. In the latter—the *δικαίωσις*—Christ's intercession is also included; for the Lutheran theology (Quenstedt) denotes the *applicatio acquisitæ salutis* as the purpose of the *intercessio* [the Reformed theology: *patrocinium perpetuum coram Patre adversus Satanæ criminationes*]. Melanchthon also remarks in this sense: "*Quamquam enim* PRÆCESSIT *meritum, tamen ita ordinatum fuit ab initio, ut tunc signalis* APPLICARETUR, *cum fide acciperent*." We must bear in mind, however, that the antithesis is not: Christ's death and resurrection, but *the deliverance of Christ for our offences*, and *his resurrection on God's part*. The principal weight of the antithesis therefore rests upon the Divine deed of Christ's resurrection; with which justifying faith was first called into living existence. This justifying faith is analogous to Abraham's faith in the God of miracles, who calls new life into being. To this, the deliverance of Christ to death for our sins (transgressions, falls, *παραπτώματα*) forms a complete antithesis; and to this corresponds, in the single work of redemption, the antithesis: the abolishment of our guilt, and the imputation of His righteousness. Yet, in reality, these two cannot be separated from each other, and the *δικαίωσις* here means the general and potential justification which is embraced in the atonement itself, and which, in individual justification by faith, is appropriated by individuals only by virtue of its eternal operation through the *intercessio*, the gospel, and the spirit of Christ. [See *Doctrinal and Ethical*, No. 10.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. As Paul has proved from the Old Testament the truth of the New Testament, and especially the doctrine of righteousness by faith, so can the evangelical Church confirm the truth of its confession by the best testimonies of the best fathers of the Catholic Church. The *evangelical* confession of *sin* and *grace* is defended against the Romanists by Augustine, and others, in the same way that Abraham defended the believing Gentiles against the Jews. [On Augustine's doctrine of sin and grace, comp. my *Church History*, vol. iii. pp. 783-865. Augustine differs in form from the Protestant doctrine of justification, since he confounded the term with sanctification; but he agrees with it in spirit, inasmuch as he derived the new life of the believer exclusively from the free grace of God in Christ, and left no room for human boasting. The same may be said of Anselm, St. Bernard, and the forerunners of the Reformation —P. S.]

2. Here, as in the Epistle to the Galatians, and especially in chap. iii., the Apostle characterizes the *Old Testament* according to its real fundamental thought—the *promise of God*, which was revealed in *Abraham's faith*, and perfectly fulfilled in the New Testament covenant of faith. Accordingly, the Mosaic legislation is only a more definite Old Testament signature; but, as a stage of development, it is subordinate to Abraham's faith (see chap. v. 20; Gal. iii. 17).

Some errors of the present day concerning the Old Testament have in many ways obscured its true relation by the following declarations: (1.) "The Old Testament is essentially Mosaism." In this way the patriarchal system in the past, and the prophetic system in the future, are abolished. (2.) "Mosaism is legal and statutory stationariness." But, on the contrary, the Old Testament is a continuous and living development. (3.) "This stationariness is theocratical despotism; the Jew is absolutely enslaved under the law." This is contradicted by Moses' account of the repeated federal dealings between Jehovah and His people, by the introduction to the Decalogue, as well as by the whole spirit of the Old Testament. It is particularly contradicted by the fact that Jehovah abandons the people to their apostasy, in order to visit them in justice.

3. The signification of Abraham for the doctrine of justification by faith is supplemented by *David's* example and testimony. Abraham was justified by faith, notwithstanding his many good works; David was likewise justified by faith, notwithstanding his great offence. The righteousness of faith is therefore thus defined: (1.) It does not presuppose any good works; but, (2.) It presupposes a knowledge of sin. On the signification of the passage, vers. 3-5, for justification by faith, see Tholuck, p. 175.

4. As Abraham became the natural father of many nations, so did he become the spiritual father of the believing people of all nations, both Jews and Gentiles.

5. The designation of circumcision as a *seal* of the righteousness of faith, is important for the doctrine of the *sacraments*. See the *Exeg. Notes*.

6. *The great promise of faith* (ver. 13). Its development (chap. viii.; Isa. lxv., lxvi.; Rev. xx.-xxii.). There is a grand view in the reasoning of ver. 14. The men who are *ἐκ νόμου, of the law*, cannot be the heirs of the world: (1.) Because they are particularists. But also, (2.) Because the legal, human *ὀργή*, provokes the historical, divine wrath —the destruction of the world. Thus did legalistic fanaticism bring on the destruction of Jerusalem, the fall of Byzantium, the exhaustion of Germany by the Thirty Years' War, the disorders in Spain, Italy, Poland, and other countries (see Matt. v. 5).

7. *The identity of the faith of Abraham with that of Paul.* We must define: (1.) Its object; (2.) Its subject; (3.) Its operations. The difference, on the contrary, must be determined according to the developing forms of the revelation of salvation, and in such a way that the initial point will appear in the faith of Abraham, and the concluding or completing point shall appear in the saving faith of the New Testament. But it is a mistake to suppose that faith can be the same thing in a subjective view, and another in an objective. The objective and subjective relations will always thoroughly correspond to each other here; and the operations of faith will be shaped in accordance with them. For

historical information on the question under consideration, see Tholuck, p. 178.

8. On the nature of *saving faith*, see the *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 19. Likewise, on the signification of the resurrection for faith, those on ver. 25.

9. The importance of the sentiment, "He gave God the glory." See the *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 20.

[10. On ver. 25. This important and comprehensive passage clearly shows the *inseparable connection* between *Christ's death* and *Christ's resurrection*, as also the connection between the *remission* of sins and *justification* to a new life (comp. v. 10; vi. 4). By His atoning death Christ has abolished the guilt of sin (iii. 25), and secured our pardon and peace; and hence it is generally represented as the ground of our justification (δικαίωσις)—*i. e.*, the non-imputation of sin, and the imputation of Christ's merits; comp. iii. 24, 25; v. 9; 2 Cor. v. 21; Eph. i. 7; 1 John i. 7. But, without the resurrection, the death of Christ would be of no avail, and His grave would be the grave of all our hopes, as the Apostle clearly says, 1 Cor. xv. 17. A gospel of a *dead* Saviour would be a miserable failure and delusion. The resurrection is the victory of righteousness and life over sin and death. It is by the fact of the resurrection that Christ's death was shown to be the death of the innocent and righteous One for foreign guilt, and that it was accepted by God as a full satisfaction for the sins of the world. If man had not sinned, Christ would not have died; if Christ had sinned, He would not have been raised again. In the next place, as the resurrection is the actual triumph of Christ, so it is also the necessary condition of the *appropriation* of the benefits of His death. It is only the risen Saviour who could plead our cause at the mercy-seat, and send the Holy Spirit to reveal Him, and to apply the benefits of the atonement to believers. Just as little as the death and the resurrection, can we separate the *effects* of both—the remission of sins and the new life of Christ. The sinner cannot be buried with Christ, without rising with Him as a new creature; the death of the old Adam is the birth of the new, and the life of the new presupposes the death of the old.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 1–8. Abraham and David as examples of the righteousness of faith. 1. Abraham; 2. David.—What hath father Abraham found? 1. No reward by works; but, 2. Righteousness by faith (vers. 1–5).—Abraham not only the natural, but also the spiritual father of his people (vers. 1–5).—Glory before God is better than the glory of works (ver. 2).—If the reward is reckoned of debt, man loses; but if it is reckoned of grace, he gains (vers. 4, 5).—How blessed is the man to whom God imputeth not sin, but righteousness! (vers. 6–8).—Two beatitudes from the mouth of David (vers. 6–8).

Vers. 9–12. Why must even the Jews acknowledge the Gentiles' righteousness of faith? Answer: Because, 1. Faith was not counted to Abraham for righteousness while in circumcision; but, 2. His faith had already been counted to him for righteousness.—As the sign of circumcision was to the Jews a seal of the righteousness of faith, so are the signs of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper seals to Christians of the righteousness of faith.—Abraham, a father of all believers: 1. From among the Gentiles; 2. From among the Jews (vers. 11, 12).—Walking in the footsteps of Abraham (ver. 12).—The promise to Abraham of the inheritance of the world is, first, obscure, as a germ-like word. But, second, it is of infinitely rich meaning; for, in addition to the redemption of the world, it also embraces the renewal of the world and the heavenly inheritance.—To what extent does the law work wrath? (ver. 15).—It is only by faith that the promise holds good for all (ver. 16).

Vers. 18–22. The strength of Abraham's faith. It is shown: 1. In his believing in hope, where there was nothing to hope; 2. In holding fast to this hope against external evidence; 3. He did not doubt, but trusted unconditionally in the words of promise.—Believing in hope, when there is nothing to hope (ver. 18).—We must not grow weak in faith, even if it be long before our hopes are realized (ver. 19).—The worst doubt is doubting the promises of God (ver. 20).—How precious it is to know to a perfect certainty that God can perform what He has promised (ver. 21).

Vers. 23–25. As Abraham believed that life would come from death, so do we believe in the same miracle: 1. Because God has given us a pledge in the resurrection of Christ; 2. Because this God is a living and true God, who will keep His promises for ever.—Our faith in the Lord Jesus Christ is a faith in the Redeemer, who: 1. Was delivered for our offences; and, 2. Was raised for our justification (vers. 24, 25).

LUTHER: Faith fulfils all laws; but works cannot fulfil a tittle of the law (James ii. 10). A passage from the preface to the Epistle to the Romans is in place here: "Faith is not the human delusion and dream which some mistake for faith. . . . But faith is a Divine work in us, which changes us, and gives us the new birth from God (John i. 13); which slays the old Adam, and makes us altogether different men in heart, spirit, feeling, and strength; and which brings with it the Holy Spirit. Oh, faith is a living, creative, active power, which of necessity is incessantly doing good! It also does not ask whether there are good works to perform; but, before the question is asked, it has already done them, and is continually doing them," &c.—He who believes God, will give Him the glory, that He is truthful, omnipotent, wise, and good. Therefore faith fulfils the first three (four) commandments, and justifies man before God. It is, then, the true worship of God (chap. iv. 20).

STARKE: The Holy Scriptures must not be read superficially, but with deliberation, and with careful reference to their order and chronology (chap. iv. 10).—The holy sacraments assure believers of God's grace, and forgiveness of sins and eternal salvation (chap. iv. 11).—It is vain to boast of pious ancestry, if you do not walk in the footsteps of their faith (chap. iv. 12).—God has His special gracious gifts and rewards, which He communicates to one of His believers instead of another (chap. iv. 17).—We should rely on and believe in God's word, more than in all the arguments in the world. It should be enough for us to know, "Thus saith the Lord" (chap. iv. 18).—The heart can be established by no other means than by grace. But there can be no grace in the heart except by faith, which brings in Christ, the source of all grace (chap. iv. 21).—Blessed are they who only believe, though they see not (chap. iv. 22).—The Epistle to the Romans was also written for us, and it has been preserved until our day, and

given to us as a precious treasure by Divine Providence.—If Christ has been raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, His death is truly a sufficient offering and ransom for our sins (chap. iv. 25).—HEDINGER: Away with the leaven of Pharisaic delusion, that our own righteousness must build a ladder to heaven! God will glorify His compassion to publicans and sinners, but not to proud saints.—Faith is in its highest degree, strength, and adornment, when it beholds nothing but heaven and water, God and despair, and yet believes that all will be well, glorious, and happy (chap. iv. 18).

QUESNEL: The more faith in a soul, the less pride there is in it (chap. iii. 27).—Ye magistrates, fathers, and mothers, if you set an example of faith, fear of God, love, righteousness, and other virtues, before those committed to you, you will truly become their fathers, just as Abraham became the father of the faithful by his faith (chap. iv. 11).—He who makes a parade of himself, may easily despair afterwards because of his insufficiency in every respect; but he who trusts in the omnipotent God, gets strength and consolation from his own nothingness (chap. iv. 18).—CRAMER: The sacraments do not help for the work's sake; otherwise Abraham would have been immediately justified and saved on account of circumcision (chap. iv. 10).—All promises spring from the fountain of eternal grace (chap. iv. 13).—*Nova Bibl. Tub.*: The laws of nature are set by God for nature, but they are not binding on God Himself. Faith looks beyond them (chap. iv. 19).—LANGE: As sin, because of its magnitude and multiplicity, is denoted by different words, so is justification, as something great and important, explained by three words: to forgive, to cover, and not to impute (chap. iv. 7).—The creation and resurrection of the dead are those great works of God which confirm and explain each other. Therefore he who believes in creation will find it easy to believe in the resurrection of the dead (chap. iv. 17).

BENGEL: The divine promise is always the best support of faith and confidence (ver. 20).—Why do we believe in God? Because He has raised Christ (ver. 25).

GERLACH: Abraham only received the promise that his seed should possess the land of Canaan; but beyond the earthly, there lies the heavenly Canaan—the renewed world—which he and his real children, the believers, shall possess in Christ, his seed. The earthly Canaan was the prophetic type of this heavenly Canaan; it was the external shell which enclosed the kernel—the bud which bore and enclosed the still tender flower (chap. iv. 13).—By the clearer knowledge of the commandment sin becomes more sinful, destruction appears more prominently, lust is not subdued but becomes more violently inflamed; therefore transgression increases (chap. iv. 15).—If Abraham's clear eye of faith could penetrate the veil with so much certainty of God's majesty, how powerfully should we—to whom God has spoken by His own Son—be kindled by this love to raise our idle hands and to strengthen our weary knees (chap. iv. 23).

LISCO: Abraham's faith is an example worthy of our imitation by faith in Christ (chap. iv. 18–25).—The resurrection of Jesus was a testimony and proof of what His death has accomplished for us (for, without the resurrection, He could not have been considered the Messiah, and His death could not have been deemed a propitiatory sacrifice for the blotting out of our sins), Isa. liii. 10 ff.; chap. iv. 25.

HEUBNER: The appeal to Abraham's example is 1. Right in itself; 2. Was important for the Jews (chap. iv. 1–6).—Why does Paul cite Abraham's circumcision, and not rather the offering of Isaac? Answer: 1. Circumcision was the real sign which Abraham received by the command of God Himself 2. It was that which all the Jews, equally with Abraham, bore in their own person, and on which they founded their likeness to Abraham and their glory (chap. iv. 1).—David's feeling in the Psalms is humble, and was exalted only by grace.—The universal confession of God's children is, We are saved by grace (chap. iv. 6–8).—In the historical statement of ver. 10 there is an application to us; namely, that justification by faith must precede all good works because no good work is possible without the attainment of grace.—The preaching of the law alone with the threatened penalty repels our heart from God; and when carried to excess, it makes man angry with God, because he is driven to despair (chap. iv. 15).—Yea, if every thing were brought to us *ante oculos pedesque*, there would be no room for faith (chap. iv. 18).—Abraham is an example of a holy paternal blessing, of holy paternal hopes, and the founder of the most blessed family among men (chap. iv. 18).

DRÄSEKE: Easter: the Amen of God, the Hallelujah of men.—Our faith must be preserved, and grow amid temptations (chap. iv. 20).—The object of his faith is just as certain to the believer, as a demonstration is to the mathematician (chap. iv. 21, 22).—All the history of the Old Testament is applicable to us. The circumstances are different, but there are the same conflicts, and it is internally and fundamentally the same faith which is engaged in the struggle (chap. iv. 23, 24).—Similarity of the Christian's faith to that of Abraham.

BESSER: Luther calls ver. 25 a little covenant in which all Christianity is comprehended.

J. P. LANGE: Abraham, the original, but ever-new witness of faith: 1. As witness of the living God of revelation and miracle; 2. As witness of the perfect confidence and divine strength of a believing reliance *on God's word*; 3. As witness to the blessed operation of faith—righteousness through grace.—The life of faith not dependent: 1. On natural ancestry; 2. On works of the law; 3. On visible natural appearances.—Justification and sealing.—All faith, in its inmost nature, is similar to that of Abraham: 1. As faith before God in His word; 2. As faith in miracles; 3. As faith in the renewal of youth; 4. As faith in the rejuvenation of life from righteousness as the root.—The glorious operation of Christ's resurrection.

[BURKITT: We must bring credentials from our sanctification to bear witness to the truth of our justification.—*On the sacraments in general, and circumcision in particular.* There is a fourfold word requisite to a sacrament—a word of institution, command, promise, and blessing. The elements are ciphers; it is the institution that makes them figures. Circumcision was a sign: 1. Representative of Abraham's faith; 2. Demonstrative of original sin; 3. Discriminating and distinguishing of the true church; 4. Initiating for admission to the commonwealth of Israel; and 5. Prefigurative of baptism.—*On faith.* It has a threefold excellency: 1. Assenting to the truths of God, though never so improbable; 2. Putting men on duties though seemingly unreasonable; and 3. Enabling to endure sufferings, be they never so afflictive.—Dod

DRIDGE: We are saved by a scheme that allows us not to mention any works of our own, as if we had whereof to glory before God, but teaches us to ascribe our salvation to believing on Him who justifieth the ungodly. He who has promised, is able to perform; for with Him all things are possible. Already He hath done for us that for which we had much less reason to expect, than we now have to hope for any thing that remains. He delivered His own Son Jesus for our offences.—HENRY: It is the holy wisdom and policy of faith to fasten particularly on that in God which is accommodated to the difficulties wherewith it is to wrestle, and will most effectually answer the objections. It is faith indeed to build upon the all-sufficiency of God for the accomplishment of that which is impossible to any thing but that all-sufficiency.—CLARKE: Ver. 18. The faith of Abraham bore an exact correspondence to the power and never-failing faithfulness of God.

HODGE: 1. The renunciation of a legal self-righteous spirit is the first requisite of the gospel; 2. The more intimately we are acquainted with our own hearts, and with the character of God, the more ready shall we be to renounce our own righteousness, and to trust in His mercy; 3. Only those are happy and secure who, under a sense of helplessness, cast themselves on the mercy of God; 4. A means of grace should never be a ground of dependence 5. There is no hope for those who take refuge in a law, and forsake God's mercy; 6. All things are ours, if we are Christ's; 7. The way to get your faith strengthened, is, not to consider the difficulties in the way of the thing promised, but the character and resources of God who has made the promise; 8. It is as possible for faith to be strong when the thing promised is most improbable, as when it is probable; 9. Unbelief is a very great sin, as it implies a doubt of the veracity and power of God; 10. The two great truths of the gospel are, that Christ died as a sacrifice for our sins, and that He rose again for our justification; 11. The denial of the propitiatory death of Christ, or of His resurrection from the dead, is a denial of the gospel.—BARNES: *On the resurrection of Christ* (ver. 25). If it be asked how it contributes to our acceptance with God, we may answer: 1. It rendered Christ's work *complete;* 2. It was a proof that His work was *accepted* by the Father; 3. It is the mainspring of all our hopes, and of all our efforts to be saved. There is no higher motive that can be presented to induce man to seek salvation, than the fact that he may be raised up from death and the grave, and made immortal. There is no satisfactory proof that man can be thus raised up, but by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.—J. F. H.]

NINTH SECTION.—*The fruit of justification: Peace with God, and the development of the new life into the experience of Christian hope. The new worship of Christians: They have the free access to grace into the Holy of holies. Therefore they rejoice in the hope of the glory of God, and of the revelation of the real Shekinah of God in the real Holy of holies. They even glory in tribulation also, by which this hope is consummated. The love of God in Christ as security for the realisation of Christian hope; Christ's death our reconciliation; Christ's life our salvation. The bloom of Christian hope: The solemn joy that God is our God.*

CHAP. V. 1–11.

1 Therefore being justified by faith, we have[1] peace with God through our
2 Lord Jesus Christ: By [Through] whom also we have [have had the][2] access
by faith[3] [*or omit* by faith] into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice [tri-
3 umph][4] in [the][5] hope of the glory of God. And not only *so*, but we glory
[triumph][6] in tribulations also; knowing that tribulation worketh patience
4 [constancy];[7] And patience [constancy], experience [approval];[8] and expe-
5 rience [approval], hope: And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of
God [God's love] is shed abroad [has been poured out] in our hearts by [by
means of] the Holy Ghost which is [who was] given unto us.
6 For when we were yet[9] without strength, in due time [κατὰ καιρόν, at the
7 proper time] Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man
will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die
8 [though, for the good man, perhaps some one may even dare to die]. But
God[10] commendeth [doth establish] his love toward us, in that, while we were
9 yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then [therefore], being now justi-
fied[11] by [ἐν] his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him [or, through
10 him from the wrath]. For if, when we were [being][12] enemies, we were recon-
ciled to God by [through, διά] the death of his Son; much more, being recon
11 ciled, we shall be saved by [in, ἐν] his life. And not only *so*, but we also joy
[And not only *that*—*i. e., reconciled*—but also triumphing][13] in God through our
Lord Jesus Christ, by [through] whom we have now received the atonement
[the reconciliation].[14]

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 1.—[The reading ἔχωμεν (subjunctive, with a hortatory sense) is strongly attested by ℵ[1]. A. B[1]. C. D. K. L. many cursives and versions (including Syriac and Vulgate), also by many fathers; adopted by Lachmann (in the margin), Scholz, Fritzsche, Alford (5th ed.). This array of authorities would compel us to adopt it instead of ἔχομεν (Rec. ℵ[cor]. B[3]. F.), were it not for the following considerations: 1. The early transcribers frequently interchanged ο and ω. 2. The change having been made, it would be retained by the fathers, since it "indicates the incipient darkening of the doctrine of the righteousness of faith" (Lange). 3. The hortatory meaning is not in keeping with the context. Even Alford, after adopting the subjunctive, and alleging that it can only have the force of the imperative, denies this meaning. An exhortation on a new subject just here, would introduce a foreign element (Meyer). These reasons have been deemed, by many of the best editors, sufficient to outweigh the preponderant MSS. authority. Comp. the *Exeg. Notes*. —R.]

[2] Ver. 2.—[The perfect ἐσχήκαμεν is rendered *erlangt haben* by Lange; *have had* is the literal meaning, implying continued possession. *We obtained* (*Amer. Bible Union*) is open to the objection urged in *Exeg. Notes*. The article should be retained with *access*, as conveying a slight emphasis.—R.]

[3] Ver. 2.—[Lange rejects τῇ πίστει (*Rec.*, ℵ[1]. C. K. L., many versions). It is not found in B. D. F. G., and is rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Ewald, Alford. Meyer retains it, deeming it superfluous after ver. 1; but for that very reason likely to be omitted. A further variation, ἐν τῇ πίστει, increases the probability of its genuineness, since ἐν might readily be repeated from the preceding ἐσχήκαμεν. It may be regarded as doubtful, but we are scarcely warranted in rejecting it.—R.]

[4] Ver. 2.—[*Triumph* is not only a more literal rendering of καυχώμεθα, but can be retained throughout, wherever the verb occurs. The connection is with *have had*. If necessary, a semicolon after *stand* would indicate this.—R.]

[5] Ver. 2.—[Lange's view of this passage requires the insertion of the article, which is not found in the Greek. See *Exeg. Notes*.—R.]

[6] Ver. 3.—[*Rec.*: καυχώμεθα, ℵ. A. D. F. K. Alford considers this a mechanical repetition from ver. 2, and reads καυχώμενοι (B. C.), but the other reading is to be preferred.—R.]

[7] Ver. 3.—[Ὑπομονή, *Standhaftigkeit* (Lange); *endurance* (Alford); *patient endurance* (Wordsworth); *Ausdauer*, *perseverantia* (Meyer). The idea of *patience* is implied, but the result is referred to here.—R.]

[8] Ver. 4.—[*Approval* is certainly preferable to *experience*; and yet it is not altogether satisfactory. Lange, Meyer: *Bewährung*; Wordsworth: *proof*; Alford, *Amer. Bible Union*, as above.—R.]

[9] Ver. 6.—[The text is disputed at two points in this clause. *Rec.*, with ℵ. A. C. D[1.3]. K., and some fathers, read ἔτι γάρ; which is adopted by most modern editors. B. (followed by Alford) reads εἴγε, however. The MSS. authority for the former is so strong, that it would be adopted without hesitation, were not the decision complicated by another variation, viz., the insertion and omission of a second ἔτι after ἀσθενῶν. The authority for it (ℵ. A. B. C. D[1]. F.) is even stronger than for the first. But this repetition has been deemed unnecessary, and many critical editors have therefore rejected the second ἔτι. (So *Rec.*, Meyer, Lange apparently.) The insertion is explained as a displacement growing out of the fact, that an ecclesiastical portion began with Χριστὸς κ.τ.λ. But the uncial authority is too strong to warrant its rejection. Alford justly remarks: "We must either repeat ἔτι, . . . or adopt the reading of B." He takes the latter alternative; it seems safer, with Griesbach, Lachmann, Wordsworth, to take the former. In that case, ἔτι may either be regarded as repeated for emphasis (see *Exeg. Notes*), or Wordsworth's view be adopted: *Besides, when we were yet weak*. The former is preferable.—R.]

[10] Ver. 8.—[Ὁ Θεός is wanting in B. Its position varies in other MSS. ℵ. A. C. K. insert it after εἰς ἡμᾶς (so *Rec.*); D. F. L. before (so Tischendorf, Meyer). Alford rejects it, mainly on account of this variation in position. It is far more likely to have been omitted, because it was thought that Christ should be the subject. The most probable view is, that the Apostle intended to emphasize the fact that *God* thus showed *His* (ἑαυτοῦ) love; hence the position at the end of the clause. This not being understood, it was moved forward and then rejected.—R.]

[11] Ver. 9.—[Literally: *having been then justified*. The E. V. means to convey this thought. It should be noticed that ἐν follows (E. V., *by*). The idea of instrumentality is not prominent; the sense seems to be pregnant. So also in ver. 10: ἐν τῇ ζωῇ, *by his life*.—R.]

[12] Ver. 10.—[The parallelism is marred in the E. V.—R.]

[13] Ver. 11.—[*Rec.*: καυχώμεθα, poorly attested. Nearly all MSS. read καυχώμενοι, which is adopted by modern critical editors. On the meaning, and for justification of the above emendation, see *Exeg. Notes*.—R.]

[14] Ver. 11.—[*Atonement* is a correct rendering etymologically, but not theologically. *Reconciliation* is preferable also on the ground that it corresponds with *reconcile* (ver. 10), as the Greek noun does with the preceding verb.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

GENERAL SURVEY.—1. Peace with God arising from justification, as hope of the glory of God (vers. 1, 2). 2. The continuance in, and increase of, this peace, even by tribulations, amid the experience of the love of God (vers. 3–5). 3. The proof of the continual increase of the peace, and the certainty of salvation of Christians (vers. 6–9). 4. Reconciliation as the pledge of deliverance (salvation), and, as the appropriated atonement, the fountain of blessedness. On vers. 1–8, Winzer, *Commentat.*, Leipzig, 1832. [Chap. v. 1–12 and chap. viii. describe the effect of justification upon the feelings, or the *emotional* man; chap. vi., the effect upon the will, or the *moral* man. It produces peace in the heart and holiness in the character of the believer.—P. S.]

Ver. 1. **Therefore, being justified by faith** [Δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως]. The οὖν expresses the conclusion that arises from the preceding establishment of the truth of the δικαίωσις by faith [iii. 21–iv. 25]. Therefore δικαιωθέντες is closely connected with δικαίωσις. [The aorist tense δικαιωθέντες, which is emphatically placed at the head of the sentence, implies that justification is an act already done and completed when we laid hold of Christ by a living faith, but not necessarily at our baptism (Wordsworth), which is a sealing ordinance, like circumcision (iv. 11), and does not always coincide in time with regeneration and justification (remember the case of Abraham and Cornelius on the one hand, and Simon Magus on on the other). ἐκ πίστεως, *out of* faith, as the *subjective* or instrumental cause and appropriating organ, while the grace of God in Christ is the *objective* or creative cause of justification, by which we are transferred from the state of sin and damnation to the state of righteousness and life.—P. S.] Meyer: "The extent of the *blessedness* of the justified (not their *holiness*, as Rothe would have it) shall now be portrayed." It is a description of the blessedness of Christians in its source, its maintenance, its apparent imperfection yet real perfection, its certainty, and its ever more abundant development. The condition of one who is not justified is that of fighting with God (see ver. 9).

[**We have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ,** εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, κ.τ.λ. The bearing of the difference of reading here deserves more attention than it has yet received. We reluctantly adopt, for internal

reasons, with Dr. Lange and the great majority of commentators, the indicative *ἔχομεν*, *we have*, for the subjunctive *ἔχωμεν* (Vulg.: *habeamus*). The latter, it must be admitted, has in its favor not only the overwhelming weight of ancient MSS., Versions, and Fathers,* but also the critical canon: *lectio difficilior principatum tenet;* being the more difficult reading, its alteration into the easier *ἔχομεν* can be better accounted for than its introduction. If we retain *ἔχωμεν* (with Lachmann, Tregelles, and Alford, 5th ed.), we must consistently take *καυχώμεθα*, vers. 2, 3, likewise in the subjunctive mood; and thus the whole passage, instead of being, as usually understood, a *statement* of the blessed *effects* of justification upon the heart, becomes an *exhortation* to go on from peace to peace and from glory to glory, on the ground of the accomplished fact of justification. Different explanations, however, may be given to *ἔχωμεν*. (1.) The *deliberative* sense: *shall we have?* But the deliberative subjunctive is only used in doubtful questions, as Mark xii. 14: *δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν*; Rom. vi. 1: *ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ*; (2.) The *concessive* sense: *we may have, it is our privilege to have.* This would give excellent sense. But such a use of the Greek subjunctive approaching the meaning of the future, though easily derived from the general principle that the subjunctive mood signifies what is *objectively possible*, as the indicative expresses what is *actual*, and the optative what is *desirable* or *subjectively possible*, is somewhat doubtful, and not mentioned by Winer (p. 268, 7th ed.), who, in independent sentences, admits only the *conjunctivus adhortativus* and the *conjunctivus deliberativus;* comp. Kühner, §§ 463, 464, and Jelf, § 415. (3.) There remains, therefore, only the *hortative* sense: *let us have* peace. But here arises the doctrinal difficulty, that peace is not the result of man's exertions, but a gift of God bestowed, and the object of prayer in the epistolary inscriptions; comp. 1 and 2 Peter i. 2: "Grace and peace be multiplied unto you;" yet two analogous passages might be quoted—viz., 2 Cor. v. 19: *καταλλάγητε τῷ Θεῷ, reconciliamini Deo;* and especially Heb. xii. 28: *ἔχωμεν χάριν, let us have grace* (where, however, some MSS. read *ἔχομεν*, the Vulg. *habemus*, and where *χάρις* is understood by some in the sense of *gratitude*).† It might be said, also, in support of this explanation, that faith, hope, love, and all Christian graces, are likewise gifts of grace, and yet objects to be pursued and maintained. (4.) A few commentators, quite recently Forbes (not in the translation, but in the comments, p. 179), take *ἔχωμεν = κατέχωμεν, let us hold fast and enjoy* peace; comp. Heb. x. 23: *κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλινῆ*. But in this case we should expect the article before *εἰρήνην*, and a previous mention of peace in the argument. The indicative *ἔχομεν*, on the other hand, is free from all grammatical and doctrinal difficulty, and is in keeping with the declaratory character of the section.—**Peace with God**, *εἰρήνην πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*, in our relation to God. It expresses the state of reconciliation (opposite to the state of condemnation, viii. 1), in consequence of the removal of God's wrath and the satisfaction of His justice by the sacrifice of Christ, who is our Peace; Eph. ii. 14–16. Comp. *Herodian* 8, 7. 8: *ἀντὶ πολέμου μὲν εἰρήνην ἔχοντες πρὸς θεούς*, and other classical parallels quoted by Meyer and Philippi. On *πρὸς τὸν Θεόν* comp. Acts ii. 17; xxiv. 16; 2 Cor. vii. 4. This objective condition of peace implies, as a necessary consequence, the subjective peace of the soul, the *tranquillitas animi*, the *pax conscientiæ*, which flows from the experience of pardon and reconciliation; Phil. iv. 7; John xvi. 33. Sin is the source of all discord and war between man and God, and between man and man; and hence there can be no peace until this curse is removed. All other peace is an idle dream and illusion. Being at peace with God, we are at peace with ourselves and with our fellowmen. Paul often calls God the "God of peace;" xv. 33; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 16; Heb. xiii. 20. Comp. also Isa. xxxii. 17: "the work of righteousness is peace."—P. S.]

Ver. 2. **Through whom also we.** These words do not announce a climax in the description of the merit of Christ (Köllner); nor do they state the ground of the preceding *διὰ Ἰησοῦ X.* (Meyer), but the immediate result of the redemption. [*καί*, **also**, is not accumulative, but indicates that the *προςαγωγὴ εἰς τὴν χάριν*, itself a legitimate consequence of justification, is the *ground* of *εἰρήνη*.—P. S.]—**Have obtained access.** [*τὴν προςαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν*; literally, **have had the** (well-known, the only possible) **introduction** (in the active sense), or better, **access** (intransitive). The perfect refers to the time of justification and incorporation in Christ, and implies the continued result, since in Him and through Him, as the door and Mediator, we have an open way, the right and privilege of *daily* approach to the throne of *grace*; in distinction from the one *yearly* entrance of the Jewish high-priest into the Holy of Holies. This is the universal priesthood of believers.—P. S.] Explanations of the *προςαγωγή*: 1. Meyer: *admission, introduction* (*Hinzuführung*). This is claimed to be the only grammatical signification.* It certainly denotes the entrance effected by *mediation*, where it means admission, audience. But this requirement [the *προσαγωγεύς*, *sequester*, the mediator or interpreter, who introduces persons to sove-

* [See *Text. Note* 1. The Sinaitic MS. reads **EXÔMEN**, the small o on the top of ω being a correction by a later hand, though this correction may possibly have been taken from an older MS. Tischendorf, in his recent edition of the Vatican MS., credits the correction *ἔχομεν* to B[3]., instead of B[2]., as is done by Alford, Meyer, and others. Dr. Hodge, who pays little or no attention to the different readings, and ignores Cod. Sin. altogether, although it was published two years before the revised edition of his *Comm. on Romans*, incorrectly says (p. 205) that "the external authorities are nearly equally divided" between *ἔχομεν* and *ἔχωμεν*. Alford, in the 5th ed., has a long note and calls this "the crucial instance of overpowering diplomatic authority compelling us to adopt a reading against which our subjective feelings rebel. Every internal consideration tends to impugn it." Retaining *ἔχωμεν* in the text (with Lachmann and Tregelles), he gives it up in the notes. Forbes very strenuously contends for *ἔχωμεν*, and consistently takes also *καυχώμεθα* in the hortative sense.—P. S.]

† [Rom. xii. 18 refers to peace *with men* (like the famous sentence in Gen. Grant's letter of acceptance of the nomination for the Presidency: *Let us have peace*).—P. S.]

* [By Pape (Lex.) and Meyer, who quotes passages from Xenophon, Thucydides, Plutarch, &c., and explains: "*Wir haben* DURCH CHRISTUM DIE HINZUFÜHRUNG *zu der Gnade u. s. w., gehabt, dadurch nämlich dass Er selbst* (1 Peter iii. 18) *vermöge seines den Zorn Gottes tilgenden Sühnopfers unser προςαγωγεύς geworden ist, oder, wie es Chrys. treffend ausdrückt: μακρὰν ὄντας προςήγαγε.*" Comp. Harless (p. 251) and Braune, on Eph. ii. 18. Chrysostom distinguishes, Eph. ii. 18, *προςαγωγή* and *πρόςοδος*: *οὐκ εἶπε πρόςοδον, ἀλλὰ προςαγωγήν*. But *πρόςοδος*, in classic Greek, has both the active and passive meaning. Hesychius defines *προσαγωγή*: "*προσέλευσις, recte:* ACCESSIO, *nempe* AD DEORUM ARAS, SUPPLICATIO." The word occurs only three times in the New Testament—here, and Eph. ii. 18, and iii. 12, where the intransitive meaning, *access*, is the most natural.—P. S.]

reigns, Lamprid. in *Alex. Sev.* 4.—P. S.] is secured here by δι' οὗ, which does not well suit this interpretation. 2. *Access.* [Vulg.: *accessum;* πρόσοδος, εἴσοδος.] The view of Œcumenius, and most expositors [Philippi, Ewald, Stuart, Hodge, Alford]; see Eph. ii. 18; iii. 12. (Tholuck finally decides for the active sense.) The image, at bottom, is plainly not that of a worldly audience with an Eastern king, but the type of the entrance of the high-priest into the Holy of Holies (see 1 Peter iii. 18: Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν, ἵνα ἡμᾶς προςαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ; Heb. x. 19: ἔχοντες τὴν παῤῥησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ). This view is also in harmony with the idea of the Epistle, by which Christianity is the true worship restored, or rather first realized; and in this connection the δόξα θεοῦ has reference to the Shekinah of the Holy of Holies.—**Obtained** (*erlangt haben*). Tholuck justly regards it as pedantic prudery in Meyer (after Fritzsche) to hold that ἐσχήκαμεν does not mean *nacti sumus et habemus*, but *habuimus* (when we became Christians). Meyer more appropriately says: "The divine grace in which the justified participate is represented as a *spacial compass.*" But he has not made good this remark. We have free access into the real Holy of Holies, which is grace; and hope to behold in it the real Shekinah, the δόξα of God; and, looking at it, to participate of it.—**Into this grace.** [The ταύτην is emphatic—such a glorious grace.—P. S.] Those who adhere to the reading τῇ πίστει in ver. 2 [see *Textual Note* [3]] connect therewith εἰς τὴν χάριν (a connection which Meyer properly rejects, πίστις εἰς τὴν χάριν!), and understand προσαγωγή absolutely: access to God.* But the προσαγωγή can refer only to χάρις (Meyer, and others), and, indeed, to grace as justifying grace; and does not denote saving favor in general (Chrysostom), although that central idea of grace comprehends all. For other untenable explanations: the gospel (Fritzsche); hope of blessedness (Beza); apostleship (Semler); see De Wette. The access to this grace is more particularly explained by the addition, **wherein** [ἐν ᾗ refers to χάριν, not to the doubtful πίστει.—P. S.] **we stand,** or into which we have entered. The ἑστήκαμεν therefore does not denote here, standing fast (Tholuck, Meyer), either in the sense of subjective activity (Beausobre),† or of objective, secure possession (Calvin).‡ It refers back to the act of the δικαίωσις, with which the introduction into the χάρις has begun, and accordingly the προσαγωγή denotes the free and permanent access of all believers into the χάρις, in contrast with the once yearly entrance of the high-priest into the Holy of Holies. We need hardly mention that this permanent access is effected and conditioned by the life of prayer, and especially by daily purification, in the comfort of the atonement (Heb. x. 22, 23).

And triumph (glory) in the hope of the glory of God [καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ]. The verb καυχάομαι [usually with ἐν, also with ἐπί, ὑπέρ, and with the accusative of the object] denotes the expression of a joyous consciousness of blessedness with reference to the objective ground of blessedness; in which true glorying is distinctly contrasted with its caricature, vain boasting in a vain state of mind, and from a vain ground or occasion. Reiche emphasizes the *rejoicing*, Meyer the *glorying.* The ἐπί, explained as *propter* (by Meyer), denotes more definitely the basis on which Christians establish their glorying.* The ground of the glorying of Christians in their present state is not the δόξα θεοῦ itself, but *the hope of the glory of God*, as one conception; indeed, the whole Christianity of this life is a joyous anticipation of beholding the glory.* Tholuck: "δόξα θεοῦ is not, as Origen holds, the genitive of object, the hope of *beholding* this glory, which would need to have been expressed more definitely; still less is Chrysostom's view right, that it is the hope that God will glorify Himself in us. Neither are Luther, Grotius, Calixtus, Reiche, correct in calling it the genitive of author, the glory to be bestowed by God; but it is the genitive of possession, participation in the glory possessed by God; comp. 1 Thess. ii. 12." But more account should be made of beholding, as the means of appropriation. To behold God's glory, means also, to become glorious. This is definitely typified in the history of Moses (2 Cor. iii. 18; Exod. xxxiv. 33). Tholuck also remarks: "The θεωρεῖν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, John xvii. 24, is the participation in the δόξα θεοῦ, the συγκληρονομεῖν, the συμβασιλεύειν, and συνδοξασθῆναι τῷ Χριστῷ; Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 11. Cocceius: '*Hæc est gloriatio fidelium quod persuasum habent, fore, ut Deus gloriosus et admirabilis in ipsis fiat illuminando, sanctificando, lætificando, glorificando in ipsis;* 2 Thess. i. 10.'" As the seeing of man on God's side perfects the vision of man, according to 1 Cor. xiii. 12, it is the beholding of the glory of the Lord on man's side by which he shall become perfectly conformed to the Lord, and thus an object of perfect good pleasure, according to 1 John iii. 2; Matt. v. 8; comp. 2 Peter i. 4. The goal of this reciprocal δοξάζειν and δοξάζεσθαι is, in a conditional sense, the removal to the inheritance of glory in the future world; 2 Cor. v. 1; and, in the absolute sense, the time of the second coming of Christ; Rev. xx.

[This triumphant assurance of faith is incompatible with the Romish doctrine of the uncertainty of salvation. A distinction should be made, however, between assurance of a *present* state of grace, which is necessarily implied in true *faith*, as a personal apprehension of Christ with all His benefits, and assurance of *future* redemption, which is an article of *hope* (hence ἐπ' ἐλπίδι), and must be accompanied with constant watchfulness. Christ will lose none of those whom the Father has given Him (John xvii. 12; x. 28, 29); but God alone knows His own, and to whom He chooses to reveal it. We must give diligence to make our calling and election

* [This is not necessary. τῇ πίστει and ἐν τῇ πίστει, whether genuine or not, can be taken as explanatory of the method of access to the throne of grace. The phrase "faith on grace" nowhere occurs in the Bible.—P. S.]

† ["*Demeurer ferme signifie combattre courageusement.*"—P. S.]

‡ [". . . *ut firma stabilisque salus nobis maneat: quo significat, perseverantiam non in virtute industriave nostra, sed in Christo fundatam esse.*" So also Philippi (*feststehen, bleibend verharren*), and Hodge: "We are firmly and immovably established." Comp. John viii. 44, where it is said of Satan that he stood not (οὐχ ἕστηκεν) in the truth; 1 Cor. xv. 1; 2 Cor. i. 24.—P. S.]

* [So also Philippi: "ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, *propter spem.* ἐπί mit dem *Dative dient bei den Verbis der Affecte zur Angabe des* GRUNDES. So γελᾶν, μέγα φρονεῖν, μαίνεσθαι, ἀγανακτεῖν ἐπί τινι."—P. S.]

† [The reading of the Vulgate: *gloriæ filiorum Dei*, is according to Meyer, a gloss which admirably hits the sense. But δόξα θεοῦ is more expressive in this connection. It is the glory which God Himself has (*gen. possessionis*), and in which believers shall once share; comp. John xvii. 22; 1 Thess. ii. 12; Apoc. xxi. 11; 1 John iii. 2.—P. S.]

sure to ourselves (2 Peter i. 10), and work out our own salvation with fear and trembling, *because* God worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure (Phil. ii. 12, 13). The possibility of ultimate failure was a powerful motive and stimulus to faithfulness and holiness even in the life of an apostle, who exercised severe self-discipline, lest, having preached to others, he might himself at last be rejected, and lose the incorruptible crown of the Christian race (1 Cor. ix. 27). How much more, then, should ordinary Christians, who stand, take heed lest they fall (1 Cor. x. 12)!—P. S.]

Ver. 3. **And not only so** [*sc.*, do we triumph in the hope of glory; comp. the parallels in Meyer]. Tholuck appropriately says: "This hope of the Christian—sure of its triumph—seems to be put to scorn by the present condition, as those first Christians had to bear the scorn of the Gentiles by contrasting their gloomy present with their abundant hope. [Quotations from Minucius Felix, Arnobius, and Melanchthon.] But the Apostle's lofty mind shows how that *δόξα* is not an outward accident, but a moral glorification, having its root in this *θλίψις*; therefore this itself, as the means of perfection, is the subject of triumph." See viii. 17, 28, 35; 2 Cor. xi. 30; xii. 9, 10 [*ὅταν γὰρ ἀσθενῶ, δυνατός εἰμι*]; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Matt. v. 10, 12; Acts v. 41; 1 Peter iv. 12; James i. 3, 12. [It is a universal law, acknowledged even in the world, that no great character can become complete without trial and suffering. As the firmness of the root is tested by the storm, and the metal is purified in the heat of the furnace, so the strength and purity of character is perfected by trial. The ancient Greeks and Romans admired a good man struggling against misfortune as a spectacle worthy of the gods. Plato describes the righteous man as one who, without doing injustice, yet has the appearance of the greatest injustice, and proves his own justice by perseverance against all calumny unto death; yea, he predicts that the perfect man, if such a one should ever appear, would be scourged, tortured, and nailed to the post (*Politia*, p. 74 sq. ed. Ast.). Seneca says (*De prov.* iv. 4): "*Gaudent magni viri rebus adversis non aliter quam fortes milites bellis triumphant.*" Edmund Burke: "Obloquy is a necessary ingredient of all true glory. Calumny and abuse are essential parts of triumph" But what a difference between the proud stoicism of the heathen, who overcomes the misfortunes by haughty contempt and unfeeling indifferentism, and the Christian's gentle patience, forgiving love, and cheerful submission to the holy will of God, who ordered tribulation as a means and condition of moral perfection! Comp. my book on *The Person of Christ*, p. 90 ff., 216 f.—P. S.]

In [on account of] **tribulations.** [Comp. 2 Cor. vii. 4.] The *ἐν* must express the antithesis to the preceding; it must therefore not be explained as local. in [amidst] the tribulations (as Köllner, Glöckler, Baumgarten-Crusius). In that case, the very object of the *καυχᾶσθαι* would be wanting. [*Gloriamur de calamitatibus*, not, *in calamitatibus*. The *θλίψεις* (or their moral results rather) are the object and ground of the *καύχησις*; *καυχᾶσθαι* being mostly constructed with *ἐν*; v. 11; Gal. vi. 13; 2 Cor. x. 15. The Jew is said to glory *in* the law, the Christian in the cross, &c. So also Tholuck, Meyer, Alford, Hodge. **The tribulations are to the Christian what the scars of the battle-field are to an old soldier; comp. Gal. vi. 17.—P. S.]** *

Knowing [because we know] **that tribulation.** This is the normal development of the believer's life out of its tribulation. Yet this development is not a natural necessity (see Matt. xiii. 21). Yet it is assumed in the exceptions that the faith was somehow damaged. [The following climax is remarkably vivid and pregnant.]

Ver. 4. **Constancy** (endurance, steadfastness). The *ὑπομονή* is not *patientia* here (Vulgate, Luther, E. V.). Yet steadfastness cannot be acquired without *patientia*. Luke xxii. 28: *οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς*. Comp. James i. 3. [The virtue of *ὑπομονή*, which Chrysostom calls the *βασιλὶς τῶν ἀρετῶν*, is *patient endurance* (*Ausdauer*, *Standhaftigkeit*), and combines the Latin *patientia* and *perseverantia*. It involves the element of *ἀνδρία*, the bravery and manliness with which the Christian contends against the storms of trials and persecutions. Meyer adduces, as applicable here, Cicero's definition of *perseverantia*: "*in ratione bene considerata stabilis et perpetua permansio.*" On the difference between *ὑπομονή*, *μακροθυμία*, and *ἀνοχή*, comp. Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, Second Series, ed. 1864, p. 11.—P. S.]

Approval (proof), *δοκιμή*. [Comp. 2 Cor. ii. 9; viii. 2; ix. 13; Phil. ii. 22.] Not trial (Grotius), for the *θλίψις* itself is trial; nor experience (Luther [E. V.]), for experience is the whole Christian life. It is the condition of approval, whose subjective expression is the consciousness of being sealed; Eph. ii. 13. [Bengel: "*δοκιμή est qualitas ejus, qui est δόκιμος.*" Hodge: "The word is used metonymically for the result of trial, *i. e.*, *approbation*, or that which is proved worthy of approbation. It is tried integrity, a state of mind which has stood the test." James i. 3: *τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν*, does not contradict our passage; for *δοκίμιον*, as Philippi remarks, corresponds to *θλίψις*, and is a means of trial, or = *δοκιμασία*, trial, probation, the result of which is *δοκιμή*, approval.—P. S.]

Hope [*ἐλπίδα*, viz., *τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ*, which is naturally suggested by ver. 2. Hope, like faith and love, and every other Christian grace, is never done in this world, but always growing, and as it bears flower and fruit, its roots strike deeper, and its stem and branches expand. Every progress

* [We add the comments of Hodge: "Afflictions themselves are to the Christian a ground of glorying; he feels them to be an honor and a blessing. This is a sentiment often expressed in the word of God. Our Lord says: 'Blessed are they who mourn;' 'Blessed are the persecuted;' 'Blessed are ye when men shall revile you.' He calls on His suffering disciples to rejoice and be exceeding glad when they are afflicted; Matt. v. 4, 10–12. The apostles departed from the Jewish council, 'rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for Christ's name;' Acts v 41. Peter calls upon Christians to rejoice when they are partakers of Christ's sufferings, and pronounces them happy when they are reproached for His sake; 1 Peter iv. 13, 14. And Paul says: 'Most gladly therefore will I glory in (on account of) my infirmities' (*i. e.*, my sufferings). 'I take pleasure,' he says, 'in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake;' 2 Cor. xii. 10, 11. This is not irrational or fanatical. Christians do not glory in suffering, as such, or for its own sake, but as the Bible teaches: 1. Because they consider it an honor to suffer for Christ. 2. Because they rejoice in being the occasion of manifesting His power in their support and deliverance; and, 3. Because suffering is made the means of their own sanctification and preparation for usefulness here, and for heaven hereafter. The last of these reasons is that to which the Apostle refers in the context."—P. S.]

a Christian life strengthens its foundations.—P. S.] Thus the apparent opposite of Christian hope, affliction, or tribulation, is changed into pure hope, so that the stock of Christian hope ever becomes more intensive and abundant. Eternal profit is derived from all temporal loss and harm.

Ver. 5. **Maketh not ashamed.** Strictly: it does not shame, by causing to be deceived. [Calvin: *Habet certissimum salutis ex tum.* Bengel: *Spes erit res.* Comp. Ps. cxix. 116: אַל־תְּבִישֵׁנִי; Sept.: *μὴ καταισχύνῃς με ἀπὸ τῆς προσδοκίας μου.* Meyer quotes parallels from Plato.—P. S.] Christian hope is formed from the same material of divine spiritual life as faith and love; it is really faith itself, tending toward completion; or it is love itself as it here lives in the principles of perfection. Therefore it is infallible.

Because God's love [genitive of the subject, not of the object, as in ver. 8: *τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς*. The ground of our assurance that hope shall not put us to the shame of disappointment, is not our own strength or goodness, but the free love of God to us and in us.—P. S.] It is plain from the context that God's love to us is meant (Origen, Chrysostom, Luther, Calvin, and down to Philippi [Meyer, De Wette, Tholuck, Stuart, Alford, Hodge]), and not our love of God (Theodoret, Augustine, Klee, Glöckler [Anselm, St. Bernard, several Catholic expositors (*amor infusus, justitia infusa*), Hofmann], and others). Our love of God can at best be a testimony of our hope, but not the ground of the infallibility of our hope. See also ver. 8. Yet the antithesis should not be too strongly pressed: the love of God for us shed abroad in the heart, becomes our love to God.*—**Has been** (and continues to be) **poured out** [as in a stream, *ἐκκέχυται*]. Denoting the richest experience and sense of God's love. [Comp. Acts ii. 17; x. 45; Titus iii. 6, where *πλουσίως* is added. Philippi: "The love of God did not descend upon us as dew in drops, but as a stream which spreads itself through the whole soul, filling it with a consciousness of His presence and favor."—P. S.] †—**In our hearts.** Strictly: *throughout them: ἐν*, not *εἰς*. [*ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις* denotes the *motus in loco*, as Meyer says, or the rich diffusion of God's love within our hearts. Comp. Ps. xlv. 2, Septuagint: *ἐξεχύθη χάρις ἐν χείλεσί σου.* Alford (after Olshausen): "*ἐν* may be taken pregnantly, *ἐκκέχ. εἰς καὶ μένει ἐν*—or better, denotes the locality where the outpouring takes place—the heart being the seat of our love, and of appreciation and sympathy with God's love."—P. S.]—**By means of the Holy Spirit who was given unto us** [*διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν*]. The gift of the Holy Spirit is the causality of the experience of the love of God. Chap. viii. 15, 16; Gal. iv. 6. [The Holy Spirit mediates all the gifts of grace to us, and glorifies Christ in us. Olshausen and Alford refer the aorist participle to the pentecostal effusion of the Spirit. But this could not apply to Paul, who was called afterwards. Hence it must be referred to the time of regeneration, when the pentecostal fact is repeated in the individual.—P. S.]

Ver. 6. **For Christ, when we were yet** [*Ἔτι γὰρ Χριστὸς ὄντων ἡμῶν, κ.τ.λ.* On the different readings, *ἔτι γάρ*, *for yet*, or *still*, with a second *ἔτι* after *ἀσθενῶν* (ℵ), *εἴγε*, *if indeed*, with the second *ἔτι* (B.), *ἔτι γάρ*, without the second *ἔτι* (*text. rec.*), *εἰς τί γάρ* ((D³. F.), *εἰ γάρ*, *εἰ δέ*, see *Textual Note* ⁹.—P. S.] The *ἔτι* [*tunc adhuc*], according to the sense, belongs to *ὄντων*, &c. [Comp. Matt. xii. 46: *ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος*; Luke xv. 20: *ἔτι δὲ αὐτοῦ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος*. Similar transpositions of *ἔτι* among the classics. See the quotations of Meyer *in loc.*, and Winer, *Gramm.*, p. 515.—P. S.] Seb. Schmid, and others, have incorrectly understood *ἔτι* as *insuper* [moreover, furthermore; but this would be *ἔτι δέ*, Heb. xi. 36, not *ἔτι γάρ*.—P. S.]; contrary not only to the meaning of the word, but also to the context. They hold that the *ἔτι* does not enhance the preceding, but gives the ground why the confidence of salvation is an ever-increasing certainty. Tholuck, with Meyer, favoring the *ἔτι* at the beginning of the verse, says that *ἔτι* has been removed at the beginning because a Bible-lesson began with the verse [with the word *Χριστός*]. The result was, that it was partly removed, partly doubled, and partly corrected. We hold that the twofold *ἔτι*, which Lachmann reads [and which Cod. Sin. sustains] has a good meaning as emphasis.

When we were yet weak, or, **without** (spiritual) **strength** [*ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν ἔτι*]. The state of sin is here represented as weakness or sickness in reference to the divine life, and consequently as helplessness, in order to declare that, at that time, believers could not do the least toward establishing the ground of their hope. [Comp. Isa. liii. 4, Septuagint: *τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει*, with Matt. viii. 17: *τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβε.* Sin is here represented as helpless weakness, in contrast with the saving help of Christ's love.—P. S.] The *ἀσθενεῖς* are then denominated *ἀσεβεῖς*, **ungodly,** in order to express the thought that we, as sinners, could not add any thing to the saving act of Christ, but did our utmost to aggravate the work of Christ. Sinfulness is represented, therefore, not merely as "the need of help," and thus "as the motive of God's love intervening for salvation" (Meyer), but as the starting-point of redemption, where the love of God accomplished the great act of salvation without any co-operation of sinners—yea, in spite of their greatest opposition.

At the proper time (or, *in due season*). *Κατὰ καιρόν.* Two* connections of the *κατὰ κ.*: 1. It is united to *ὄντων*, &c. *We were weak according to the time* [*pro temporum ratione*], in the sense of excuse (Erasmus); in the sense of the general corruption (according to Calvin, Luther, Hofmann). Against this are both the position of *καιρός*, and its signification. 2. It is referred to *ἀπέθανεν*, but in different ways. Origen: at that time, when He suffered. Abelard: held awhile in death. [Kypke, Reiche, Philippi, Alford, Hodge: at the appointed time, foretold by the prophets.—P. S.] Meyer: As it was the full time [proper

* [Similarly Olshausen: "*Die Gottesliebe zum Menschen, die aber in ihm die Gegenliebe weckt* (1 John iv. 19), *und zwar nicht die Gegenliebe mit den bloss natürlichen Kräften, sondern mit den höheren Kräften des göttlichen Geistes.*" Forbes: "The love here spoken of is not God's love, as merely outwardly shown to us, but as shed abroad in our hearts as a gift, and it is placed in connection with other Christian *graces*—patience and hope."—P. S.]

† [Meyer: "*Der Begriff des Reichlichen liegt schon in der sinnlichen Vorstellung des Ausschüttens, kann aber auch wie Tit. iii. 6 noch besonders ausgedrückt werden.*"—P. S.]

* [Or three, rather; for the words have also been connected by some with *ἔτι* = *ἔτι τότε, adhuc eo tempore, at the time of our weakness.*—P. S.]

time] for the deliverance of those who lived at that time. Better: *It was the fit time in the history of humanity.* This by no means weakens the principal thought, which rather requires the definite statement that the sacrificial death of Christ was according to Divine wisdom; since the necessity for salvation and the capacity for salvation were decided with the fulness of natural corruption. The highest heroism of the self-sacrifice does not exclude its reasonableness. See Rom. xvi. 25; Gal. iv. 4; Eph. i. 10; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Titus i. 3. [κατὰ καιρόν is = ἐν καιρῷ, εἰς καιρόν, ἐπὶ καιροῦ, καιρίως, *tempore opportuno*; in opposition to παρὰ καιρόν, *tempore alieno, untimely*. Here it is essentially the same with the πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν, Eph. i. 10, and the πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, Gal. iv. 4; comp. Mark i. 15. Christ appeared when all the preparations for His coming and His kingdom in the Jewish and Gentile world were completed, and when the disease of sin had reached the crisis. This was God's own appointed time, and the most, or rather the only, appropriate time. Christ could not have appeared with divine fitness and propriety, nor with due effect, at any other time, nor in any other race or country. We cannot conceive of His advent at the time of Noah, or Abraham, or in China, or among the savage tribes of America. History is a unit, and a gradual unfolding of a Divine plan of infinite wisdom. Christ is the turning-point and centre of history, the end of the old and the beginning of the new humanity—a truth which is confessed, wittingly or unwittingly, by every date from A. D. throughout the civilized world.—P. S.]

For the ungodly. ὑπέρ, *for*, *for the good of*. It is a fuller conception than the idea *instead of*, ἀντί, if we remember that, where the question is concerning a dying for those who are worthy of death, the conception naturally involves a well-understood ἀντί. See Matt. xx. 28. The terms ὑπέρ and περί [which Paul uses synonymously, Gal. i. 4] are more comprehensive; but the expression ἀντί is the most definite one. [Meyer contends that ὑπέρ and περί always mean *for*, *in behalf of*, *for the benefit of*, and not ἀντί, *in the place of*, *loco*, although, in the case of Christ, His death for the benefit of sinners was a vicarious sacrifice; iii. 25; Eph. v. 2; 1 Tim. ii. 6. Sometimes the ὑπέρ, like the English preposition *for*, according to the context, necessarily involves the ἀντί, as in 2 Cor. v. 15, 20, 21; Gal. iii. 13; Philem. 13. The Apostle says ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν, instead of ὑπέρ ἡμῶν, in order to bring out more fully, by this strong antithesis, the amazing love of Christ.—P. S.]

Ver. 7. **For scarcely for a righteous man will one die, though, for the good man, perhaps some one may even dare to die** [Μόλις γάρ ὑπὲρ δικαίου (without the article) τις ἀποθανεῖται· ὑπὲρ γάρ (the second γάρ seems to be exceptive, and introduces a correction of the preceding with reference to μόλις: with difficulty, I say, for it is a fact that) τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ (with the article) τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν.—P. S.]. The difficulty of this verse has led to various conjectures.* The Peshito reads ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων (unrighteous), instead of ὑπὲρ δικαίου; Erasmus, Luther, Melanchthon, &c., read δικαίου and ἀγαθοῦ as neuter words; Hofmann [formerly, not now.—P. S.]: at least the latter is neuter; Origen, on the contrary, held merely δικ. as neuter, and understood by ἀγαθός, Christ as the perfectly good One. But, as Meyer properly observes, that both substantives are masculine, is evident from the antithesis ἀσεβεῖς, by which the question is generally concerning a dying for persons. [δικαίου, without the article, must be masculine—a righteous *person* (not *the right* τὸ δίκαιον); but τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, with the article may, grammatically, be taken as neuter = *summum bonum* (the country, or any good cause or noble principle for which martyrs have died in ancient and modern times). Yet, in this case, the antithesis would be lost, since Christ likewise died for the highest good, the salvation of the world. The antithesis is evidently between men who scarcely are found to die for a δίκαιος, though occasionally perhaps for ὁ (their) ἀγαθός, and Christ who died for ἀσεβεῖς, ver. 6; or ἁμαρτωλοί, ver. 8; and even for ἐχθροί (the very opposite of ἀγαθός), ver. 10. In both cases, the death for persons, not for a cause, is meant.—P. S.]

Explanations of the masculines:

(1.) There is no material difference between δίκαιος and ἀγαθός. "After Paul has said that scarcely for a 'righteous' man will one die, he will add, by way of establishing his assertion, that there might occur instances of the undertaking of such a death." Meyer, in harmony with Chrysostom, Theodoret, Erasmus, Calvin,* &c. But δίκαιος is not ἀγαθός, and μόλις (*scarcely*) is not τάχα (*possibly*).

(2.) ὁ ἀγαθός is the benefactor. Knachtbull [*Animadv. in libros N. T.*, 1659, p. 120], Estius [Cocceius, Hammond], and many others; Reiche Tholuck: *The Friend of Man.* This is too special.

(3.) The ἀγαθός stands above the merely righteous or just one. Ambrosiaster: the noble one, the ἀγαθός by nature; Bengel: *homo innoxius exempli gratia*, &c. ["δικ., indefinitely, implies a harmless (guiltless) man; ὁ ἀγαθός, one perfect in all that piety demands, excellent, bounteous, princely, blessed—for example, the father of his country."—P. S.]

Meyer regards all these as "subtle distinctions." [He quotes, for the essential identity of δίκαιος and ἀγαθός, Matt. v. 45; Luke xxiii. 50; Rom. vii. 12, where both are connected.—P. S.] Then the difference between the Old and New Testament would also be a subtle drawing of distinctions. The Old Testament, even in its later period, scarcely produced one kind of martyrdom; but the New Testament has a rich martyrdom. Yet we would understand the ἀγαθός in a more general sense. The δίκαιος instills respect, but he does not establish, as such, a communion and exchange of life; but the ἀγαθός inspires. Paul's acknowledgment here, which was supported by heathen examples, is a proof of his apostolic considerateness, and of his elevation above all slavery to the letter. An ecclesiastical rhetorician would have suppressed the concession. The selection of the expression with τάχα and τολμᾷ is admirable; such self-sacrifices are always made headlong in the ecstasy of sympathetic generosity.

* [Jerome, *Ep.* 121 *ad Algas.*, mentions five explanations; Tholuck.—P. S.]

* [Calvin: "*Rarissimum sane inter homines exemplum exstat, ut pro justo quis mori sustineat: quamquam illud nonnunquam accidere possit.*" The exception establishes the rule. Fritzsche, Hofmann (in the *second* edition of his *Schriftbeweis*, ii. 1, p. 348), and Meyer (4th ed.) have returned to this view. In the 1st ed. (which Hodge, p. 214 seems alone to have consulted), Meyer took τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, on account of the article, as neuter (as did Jerome, Erasmus, Luther, Melanchthon, Rückert, and Hofmann in the *first* edition of his *Schriftbeweis*), and rendered the latter clause of the verse interrogatively: "*denn wer wagt's auch leichtlich für das Gute zu sterben?*—P. S.]

4. **It is hardly necessary to mention the view** [maintained by Meyer in the first edition, but now given up by him.—P. S.], that the second member of the sentence is interrogative: *for who would dare to die readily even for the good?*

[I can see no material difference between interpretations 2 and 3. The principal point in both is the distinction made between δίκαιος (taken in a narrower sense) and ὁ ἀγαθός, corresponding to our distinction between *just* and *kind*. Such a distinction is made by Cerdo in Irenæus *Adv. hær.* i. 27, quoted also by Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 11: τὸν μὲν δίκαιον, τὸν δὲ ἀγαθὸν ὑπάρχειν, *alterum quidem* JUSTUM, *alterum autem* BONUM *esse*; and by Cicero, *De offic.*, iii. 15: "*Si vir bonus is est qui prodest quibus potest, nocet nemini, recte* (*certe*) JUSTUM *virum*, BONUM *non facile reperiemus*" (but some editions read: "*certe istum virum bonum*").* The righteous man, who does all that the law or justice requires, commands our respect and admiration; the good man, the benefactor, who is governed by love, inspires us with love and gratitude. Then we would have the following sense: "It is hardly to be expected that any one would die for a righteous man, though for the good man (*i. e.*, for a kind benefactor or intimate friend), this self-denial might possibly be exercised, and does occasionally occur. So Olshausen, Tholuck, Philippi, Turner, Stuart, Hodge, Alford, Wordsworth. The latter refers to the death of Orestes for Pylades, his *al er ego*, and of Alcestis for Admetus, her husband. Webster and Wilkinson: "To make the admission less at variance with the first assertion, he substitutes for δικαίου, τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, the man of eminent kindness and philanthropy, the well-known benefactor, χρηστός, 'bonus,' in advance of δικαίου." The article before ἀγαθοῦ may be pressed as justifying the distinction: *a* righteous man, *the* good man, good to *him*, *his* benefactor. I confess, I am not quite satisfied with this interpretation, but it is better than any other.—P. S.]

Ver. 8. **But God doth establish** [giveth proof of, συνίστησιν, as in iii. 5; comp. *Textual Note* [3], on p. 113.—P. S.] God proves not merely His love in the death of Christ for sinners, according to ver. 6, but He makes it conspicuous and prominent; He exhibits it; He makes it the highest manifestation of His gospel. See John iii. 16; 2 Cor. v. 19–21. Luther: *He praises* [E. V., *He commends*] *His love toward us* [τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην, His own love, in contrast with the love of men, ver. 7.—P. S.]

Ver. 9. **Much more, therefore, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved through him from the wrath** [ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς, from the well-known and well-deserved wrath to come.—P. S.] According to Estius, a conclusion *a minori ad majus*; according to Meyer, a conclusion *a majore ad minus*.† Both are in part right and in part wrong, because neither view exactly applies. It is a conclusion from the principle to the consequence, and a conclusion from the truth of the almost incredible to the truth of that which is self-evident. The conclusion is still further strengthened by the antithesis: as enemies, we were justified by His blood, and, as being His fellow-participants in peace, we shall be preserved from the wrath by the glorious exercise of His authority, and then by His life. Preservation from wrath is a negative expression of perfect redemption. 1 Thess. i. 10. Compare the positive expression of 1 Tim. iv. 18.—[**By his blood.** αἷμα is the concrete expression for the atoning death of Christ, which is the meritorious cause of our justification. This does not rest on our works, nor our faith, nor any thing we have done or can do, but on what Christ has done for us comp. iii. 25.—P. S.]

Ver. 10. **For if, being enemies** [εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες]. It may be asked whether ἐχθροί—that is, God's enemies—is to be explained actively or passively; whether it denotes the enemies [haters] of God, according to chap. viii. 7 [ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν]; Col. i. 21 (Eph. ii. 15 does not belong here), or those who are charged with God's wrath [hated by God], for which view Rom. xi. 28 [where ἐχθροί is the opposite of ἀγαπητοί; comp. also θεοστυγεῖς, i. 18, and τέκνα ὀργῆς, Eph ii. 3.—P. S.] has been cited. The passive interpretation has been supported by Calvin, Reiche, Fritzsche, Tholuck, Krehl, Baumgarten-Crusius, De Wette, Philippi, Meyer [Alford, Hodge], and the active or subjective interpretation by* Spener, Tittmann, Usteri, and Rückert [among English commentators, by Turner]. Meyer says in favor of the first view: 1. "Christ's death did not destroy the enmity of men toward God; but, by effecting their pardon on the part of God, it destroyed *the enmity of God toward men*, whence the cessation of man's enmity toward God follows as a moral consequence, brought about by faith. 2. And how could Paul have been able to infer properly his πολλῷ μᾶλλον, &c., since the certainty of the σωθησόμεθα rests on the fact that we stand in a friendly relation (grace) to God, and not on our being friendly toward God?" These two arguments have a very orthodox sound, but are without a vital grasp of the fact of the atonement, and here without force. For, first of all, the death of Christ is as well a witness and seal of God's love, which overcomes man's enmity and distrust, as it is an offering of reconciliation, which removes the ὀργὴ θεοῦ in His government and in the conscience of man. This element constitutes the principal motive force in the living preaching of the gospel; for example, among the Moravians. In the next place, if we look away from God's work in man, we have no ground for assuming an increase [πολλῷ μᾶλλον] in God's love and grace in itself. God is unchangeable; man is changeable. The changed relation of man to God is indeed conditioned by a changed relation of God to him; but it is by virtue of God's unchangeableness that the work of God, which has begun in man, bears the pledge of completion. See Phil. i. 6. The sealing signifies, not a sealing of God, but of man by God's grace. It is not biblical to say, that Christ, by His death, has removed God's enmity toward us. And yet the Apostle is alleged to say that here, just after he has said: But God sets forth and commends His love, &c. Then the odd sense would be: We

* [Tholuck (and Stuart after him) quotes a number of passages from the classics and the Talmud, which to my mind have no force at all.—P. S.]

† [So also Hodge: "It is an argument *a fortiori*. If the greater benefit has been bestowed, the less will not be withheld. If Christ has died for His enemies, He will surely save His friends."—P. S.]

* [The original, by mistake, mentions here Tholuck, who holds the opposite view, at least in the fifth and last edition of his *Comm.*, p. 210, and says that the ὀργὴ θεοῦ necessarily implies also an ἔχθρα θεοῦ, although both are to be taken in a relative sense only, as the wrath and enmity of a *father* toward his children. He quotes the sentence of Hugo of St. Victor. "*Non quia reconciliavit amavit, sed quia amavit reconciliavit.*"—P. S.]

have been even reconciled when we were not yet reconciled!

We were reconciled to God [κατηλλάγημεν τῷ Θεῷ].

[Some preliminary philological remarks on this important term, which occurs here for the first time, may be found useful. The verbs *διαλάσσω, καταλάσσω, ἀποκαταλάσσω, συναλάσσω* (from *ἀλάσσω, to change*), express the general idea of a change of relation of two parties at enmity into a relation of peace, or the idea of reconciliation (*Versöhnung, Aussöhnung*), with a slight modification, indicated by the prepositions—*κατά, in relation to; διά, between; ἀπό, from; σύν, with*, but without reference to the question whether the enmity be mutual, or on one side only—which must be decided by the connection. The noun *διαλλαγή* is more frequently used in the classics than *καταλλαγή*, but nowhere in the New Testament; the verb *διαλάσσω*, or *διαλάττω* occurs only once; in the pass. aor. 2 imperat., Matt. v. 24: *διαλλάγηθι τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου, be reconciled to thy brother*. The noun *καταλλαγή* is used four times in the New Testament; Rom. v. 11 (E. V., *atonement*); xi. 15 (the *reconciling*); 2 Cor. v. 18, 19 (*reconciliation*, twice); the corresponding verb *καταλάσσω* occurs six times—Rom. v. 10 (twice); 1 Cor. vii. 11; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20—and is always rendered in our E. V. *to reconcile*. The translation *atonement*, at the close of Rom. v. 11, is etymologically correct (at-one-ment = *reconciliation*), but theologically wrong in the present use of the term = *propitiation*, *expiation* (which corresponds to the Greek *ἱλασμός*; 1 John ii. 2; iv. 10). The *καταλλαγή*, in the Christian sense, signifies the great change in the relation betwen God and man, brought about by the voluntary atoning sacrifice of Christ, whereby God's wrath has been removed, His justice satisfied, and man reunited to Him as His loving and reconciled Father. Some confine the word simply to a reconciliation of man to God, on the ground that no change can take place in God, or that God never hated the sinner. Others forget that the death of Christ is itself the most amazing exhibition of God's love, whereby He attracts the sinner to Him. The two sides must not be abstractly separated. It is God who, in His infinite love, establishes a new relation between Himself and mankind through the atoning sacrifice of His Son, and removes all legal obstructions which separated us from Him; and on the ground of this objective and accomplished expiation (*ἱλασμός*) and reconciliation (*καταλλαγή*), we are called upon to be reconciled to Him (*καταλλάγητε τῷ Θεῷ*; 2 Cor. v. 20; comp. *σώθητε ἀπό, κ.τ.λ.*, Acts ii. 40), *i. e.*, to lay aside all enmity and distrust, and to turn in love and gratitude to Him who first loved us. Both sides are beautifully connected in 2 Cor. v. 18–20 (which is often one-sidedly and wrongly quoted against the doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice), viz., the reconciliation effected once for all by God Himself through the death of His Son, having the world for its object and remission of sins for its effect; and the reconciliation of men to God as a moral process, in which men are exhorted to take part. The first is a finished act of infinite mercy on the part of God in Christ; the second, a change of feeling and a constant duty of man in consequence of what has been done for him. Comp. Kling and Wing on the passage in Lange on 2 Cor., p. 98 f., Amer. edition. Archbishop Trench (*Synonymes of the New Testament*, Second Part, p. 137 f.) gives the following judicious explanation of the term: "The Christian *καταλλαγή* has two sides. It is first a reconciliation, '*quâ Deus nos sibi reconciliavit*,' laid aside His holy anger against our sins, and received us into favor—a reconciliation effected once for all for us by Christ upon His cross; so 2 Cor. v. 18, 19; Rom. v. 10; in which last passage *καταλλάσσεσθαι* is a pure passive, '*ab eo in gratiam recipi, apud quem in odio fueris*.' But *καταλλαγή* is secondly, and subordinately, the reconciliation, '*quâ nos Deo reconciliamus*,' the daily deposition, under the operation of the Holy Spirit, of the enmity of the old man toward God. In this passive middle sense *καταλλάσσεσθαι* is used; 2 Cor. v. 20; and cf. 1 Cor. vii. 11. All attempts to make this, the secondary meaning of the word, to be the primary, rest not on an unprejudiced exegesis, but on a foregone determination to get rid of the reality of God's anger against sin. With *καταλλαγή* connects itself all that language of Scripture which describes sin as a state of enmity (ἔχθρα) with God (Rom. viii. 7; Eph. ii. 15; James iv. 4); and sinners as enemies to Him, and alienated from Him (Rom. v. 10; Col. i. 21); Christ on the cross as the Peace, and Maker of peace between God and man (Eph. ii. 14; Col. i. 20); all such language as this, 'Be ye reconciled with God' (2 Cor. v. 20)."—P. S.]

Meyer: "Accordingly it is necessary to understand *κατηλλάγημεν* and *καταλλαγέντες* not actively, but passively: *reconciled with God*, so that He is no more hostile to us, having given up His wrath against us." On Tittmann's attempt to distinguish between *διαλλάττειν* and *καταλλάττειν*, see Tholuck on *The Sermon on the Mount*, Matt. v. 24.* The definition of these expressions is certainly connected with the explanation of *ἐχθροί*. It may be asked, however, whether the meaning is: God has been reconciled toward us (Meyer, Philippi); or: we have been reconciled toward God; or: there has been a mutual reconciliation? The first cannot be said [?], since the *καταλλαγή* denotes a change [from enmity to friendship]; also the *καταλλαγή* in 2 Cor. v. 18, "*τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ*," must be carefully distinguished from the *ἱλασμός* (see my *Angewandte Dogmatik*, p. 858).† The sense is, therefore: While we were still enemies, adversaries of God, we were delivered by the death of Jesus, and the expiating *ἱλασμός*, which is identical with it, from guilty subjection to the punishment of the *ὀργή*, and have been made objects of His conquering operation of love; and now, in the light of this operation of love, we have a heart delivered from the enmity of alienation from God—a heart which, in the train of love, has joy in God. But how can we distinguish between the objective and subjective change of humanity? It is plain, from the risen Redeemer's salutation of peace and His gospel-message, that the love of Christ on the cross conquered the hatred of humanity. The risen Saviour's salutation of peace contains the "peace on earth." Add to all this the difference and antithesis between vers. 8, 9, 10, which are completely ob-

* [And also the note of Fritzsche on Rom. v. 10. Tittmann, *De Synon. N. T.*, i. 102 (approved by Robinson sub *καταλάσσω*), makes *διαλάττειν* to mean "*efficere ut quæ fuit inimicitia* MUTUA, *ea esse desinat*," and *καταλάττειν*, "*facere ut* ALTER *inimicum animum deponat*." This distinction is arbitrary and fanciful. Comp. the preceding remarks.—P. S.]

† [In vol. iii., p. 858, of his work on *Dogmatics*, Dr. Lange distinguishes between *καταλλαγή* as belonging to the prophetical, *ἱλασμός* to the priestly, and *ἀπολύτρωσις* to the kingly office of Christ.—P. S.]

secured by the prevalent explanation above alluded to. The clause, *God commendeth his love toward us*, is the inscription to the antithesis, namely: 1. *Christ died for us* when we were yet *sinners*. Through His (atoning) *blood* we have been justified, delivered from the sense of the ὀργή. The effect is, that much more, as being *justified* (negatively), we shall be saved from the ὀργή which will finally come upon the world. All this is ἱλασμός, *expiating* destruction of the *guilt of sin*. 2. The *Son of God* suffered death while we were *enemies*. Through *His death* we are reconciled to God. The effect is, that much more, as being *reconciled* (positively), we shall be delivered in the mighty power and rule of His life. καταλλαγή is all this.

[**In** (*i. e.*, in vital union with) **his life**, ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ, in antithesis to διά (through, by means of) τοῦ θανάτου. If even the death of Christ has such a saving efficacy, how much more His risen life, which triumphed over the realm of death and hell, ascended to the right hand of God Almighty, is clothed with all power in heaven and earth, and which, being communicated by the Holy Ghost to the believer, will conquer in him all opposition, and bring the work of salvation commenced here to a final and glorious consummation. Comp. John xiv. 19: "Because I live, ye shall live also;" Rom. viii. 11; Gal. ii. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 28; Heb. vii. 25. Salvation is effected by the death of Christ, but actually applied by His life; or His death is the meritorious, His life the efficacious cause of our salvaton. Hodge: "There is, therefore, most abundant ground for confidence for the final blessedness of believers, not only in the amazing love of God, by which, though sinners and enemies, they have been justified and reconciled by the death of His Son, but also in the consideration that this same Saviour that died for them still lives, and ever lives, to sanctify, protect, and save them."—P. S.]

Ver. 11. **And not only that, but also triumphing in God** [Οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι (which is the correct reading, instead of the *rec.* καυχώμεθα, see *Textual Note* [13]) ἐν τῷ Θεῷ]. Explanations: 1. The participle καυχώμενοι stands for the finite verb; therefore we must supply ἐσμέν (hence the readings καυχώμεθα, καυχῶμεν). Rückert, Tholuck. Only σωθησόμεθα must be supplied to μόνον δέ. The construction then runs thus, according to De Wette: We have not only the hope of escaping from the wrath of God, but we also glory in God. 2. The participle cannot stand for the finite verb (see, on the contrary, the discussions with Meyer, in Tholuck). But even here σωθησόμεθα only is to be supplied. The sense, then, is this: but not only shall we be *saved* by His life, but so that with this σώζεσθαι we shall also glory in God. [Alford: "Not only shall we be saved, but that in a triumphant manner and frame of mind."] 3. Καταλλαγέντες must be supplied. *Not only reconciled, but also glorying*. Thus formerly Fritzsche, Köllner, Glöckler, Baumgarten-Crusius, and Meyer in his earlier editions. This explanation is proved to be relatively the most correct, as the σώζεσθαι denotes not a mere degree of salvation, but comprises salvation to the point of completion, and as καταλλαγέντες is repeated in δι' οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν. Our view is, however, that we have here an antithesis of climaxes. Οὐ μόνον σωθησόμεθα—καταλλαγέντες ἐν τῇ ζωῇ Χριστοῦ—ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The rising climax is the following: 1. We are delivered from the wrath. 2. We are safely harbored in the life of Christ. 3. God, in His love, has become, through Christ, our God, in whom we glory. We glory not only in the hope of the δόξα of God, and not only conditionally in tribulations, &c., but we glory absolutely in God as our God; see chap. viii.

Through whom we have now. Reference to the future glory, as it is grounded in the experience of the present salvation, and ever develops itself from this base.—**Have appropriated** [τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν]. So we translate the ἐλάβομεν (*angeeignet haben*), to emphasize the fact of the ethical appropriation, which is very important for the beginning of the following section.

[It is safe to infer from ἐλάβομεν that καταλλαγή primarily means here a new relation of God *to us*, which He has brought about and which we *receive*, not a new relation of man *to God*, or a moral change in us, although this is a necessary moral consequence of the former, and inseparable from it. Hence καταλλαγέντες, in Rom. v. 10, is parallel with δικαιωθέντες, ver. 9: δικαιωθέντες σωθησόμεθα—καταλλαγέντες σωθησόμεθα. The article before καταλλαγήν indicates the well-known, the only possible *reconciliation*, that which was brought about by the atoning sacrifice of Christ. The E. V. here exceptionally renders κατ. by *atonement*, which, in its old sense (= at-one-ment), meant *reconciliation*, but is now equivalent to *expiation*, *propitiation*, *satisfaction*. The *expiation* of Christ (ἱλασμός, ἱλαστήριον, the German *Versühnung*) is the ground and condition of the *reconciliation* of God and man (καταλλαγή, *Versöhnung*). Bengel says, on Rom. iii. 24: "*Propitiation* (ἱλασμός) takes away the offence against God; *reconciliation* (καταλλαγή) has two sides (*est* διπλευρος): it removes (*a.*) God's indignation against us; 2 Cor. v. 19; (*b.*) our alienation from God; 2 Cor. v. 20." In the same place Bengel distinguishes between καταλλαγή and ἀπολύτρωσις (*redemption*, *Erlösung*), by referring the former to God, the latter to enemies—*i. e.*, sin and Satan. He remarks, however, that ἱλασμός and ἀπολύτρωσις are fundamentally one single benefit, namely, the *restitutio peccatoris perditi*.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Ver. 1. The *effect* of justification is *peace with God*. Peace with God takes the place of our guilty relation, in which God *seemed* to be our enemy, because He was hostile to our sins—with which we were identified—and in his ὀργή separated us from Him, in order to separate us from sin. In this relation of guilt *we were really* His enemies, although we wished to appear to be the contrary. God, in His government, likewise seemed to oppose us unto death, as we opposed Him. And therefore we were at variance also with the best portion of the world, and with the kingdom of all good spirits, as we were at variance with ourselves and with God. But, with our justification, peace is established, and with it the reverse relation in all these respects. We should not speak of the peace of God as of a mere sensation; in the feeling of peace, the most glorious actual relation is reflected. We are not only in harmony, but in covenant union with God; not only in harmony with ourselves, but true to ourselves; not only in harmony with God's presence and government in the world, and in all events, but also in con

nection with and under the protection of "all the stars of heaven."

2. [Ver. 2. *The access to the throne of grace.*] The high-priest, who went into the Holy of Holies in the hope of beholding there the glory of God, was chiefly a type of Christ, who has gone into the real Holy of Holies for His own people, and has become the real atonement for us (Heb. ix.); but he was also the type of believers, who, through Christ, likewise have free access to the Holy of Holies of grace, in the hope of beholding there the δόξα of God, and being glorified in it (see chap. viii.). On the certainty of the Christian's hope, see Tholuck, p. 202.

3. *We glory in tribulations also*, ver. 3. Tribulations—subjectively, sorrows; and, taken together, the cross which the Christian must bear after His Saviour—are not only the ordained way to glory, but also the means of promoting glory. For believers shall attain not merely the glory of the Adamic paradise, but rather the higher glory of Christ's paradise; and this they reach because they are similarly situated, and become like Him in death as in life. The Cross effects the enriched and established consummation.

4. The *glorying* of Christians is their joyous testimony of a blessed experience—the personal shape which the gospel takes. It is always conditioned according to its changing forms by a fundamental form of salvation; that is, established on the glory of God and Christ, in opposition to all the forms and disguises of self-glory.

5. The *sorites*, *tribulation worketh constancy*, &c. (vers. 3–5), represents *tribulation* also as a spiritual experience. Therefore a merely external suffering, such as any body may have, is not meant thereby, but the *cross* as a consequence of Christian faith. Faith leads into tribulation, because, as peace with God, it leads into conflict with the kingdom of darkness, and also with sin in ourselves, because it endows the ordinary suffering of this life with a spiritual character. Such a bearing of the cross looks to *constancy*, or *steadfastness* (passive *patientia* has active *patientia* as a result); *steadfastness* reaches its preliminary issue, as well as its final issue, in *approval* (experience); approval converts *hope* to confident *assurance*, which cannot deceive, because it is itself the prophecy of approaching glory. The Apostle's *sorites* describes a chain of blessed experiences, which cannot be broken unless the first links to approval are rendered brittle by insincerity, but whose strength increases from link to link to that unconquerable assurance of hope.

6. The elder dogmatics, especially the *Reformed*, have made prominent the doctrine of *approval* and *perseverance* in grace; or, what is the same, the doctrine of *sealing*. They made sealing follow justification. If this great truth had been carefully guarded, the controversy between the Lutheran and Reformed theology, as to whether a pardoned person can fall from grace, could have been regarded as a mere question of words, to be solved by the further inquiry as to whether the question concerns Christians before, or after, they are sealed. The heart's experience of justification must be put to proof, in which it becomes the historically established experience of life. Steadfastness in such proofs results inwardly in sealing by the Holy Spirit (2 Tim. ii. 19; Rev. vii. 3; ix. 4; Eph. i. 13; iv. 30), and outwardly in the establishment of the Christian in the character of his new nature (δοκιμή). The *nomen et omen indelebile* of baptism, confirmation, and ordination, becomes the real *character indelebilis* only by approval, or sealing. This is ethically connected with the fact that, by the test of tribulation and steadfastness, a purifying process has taken place, by which a separation of the most combustible material has been effected.

7. The way which Christians pursue with Christ goes *downward*, according to appearance, and often according to feeling; but it goes *upward*, according to internal operation and experience. This occurs in a threefold relation: (1.) Since all the high standpoints of worldly consciousness are without support, the Christian's position in the fellowship of Christ, who is above, is established as his second nature. (2.) The persevering fellowship in the historical ignominy of Christ, is fellowship in the historical honor which shall be received in the harvest of the world. (3.) There is forming a dynamical nature of light and heat of the inner man, which, by its impulsive and sustaining power, as well as by the still stronger upward attraction, ascends to the kingdom of glory.

8. The experience of the *love of God* in Christ for us is changed, with its joy, into pure reciprocal love; and from the complete life of love of this new birth there arises pure salvation, which, in this world, is divided into hope and patience. See chap. viii. 24, 25; 1 John iii.

9. As the Holy Spirit caused the birth of Christ, so does He cause the new birth of Christians; ver. 5.

10. The contemplation of the love of God for us, which was revealed in the *death* of Jesus, in His dying for us (ver. 8), remains the ground of *the life of love of believers*. See Philippi, p. 166. On the ὑπέρ, see Meyer, p. 150. [P. 189 f., *fourth* edition. Meyer maintains here that in all the passages which treat of the object of the death of Christ (as Luke xxii. 19, 20; Rom. viii. 32; xiv. 15, &c.), the prepositions ὑπέρ and περί mean *in commodum, for the benefit of*, and must not be confounded with ἀντί, *loco, instead of*, which Paul never uses (but Christ Himself uses it, Matt. xx. 28, δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, comp. Mark x. 45, λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν); but that Paul nevertheless teaches a *satisfactio vicaria*, by representing Christ's death as a propitiatory sin-offering, Rom. iii. 25; Eph. v. 2, &c.—P. S.]

11. After the Apostle has represented the *sorites* of the Christian's *subjective* certainty of salvation (vers. 1–5), he makes a *sorites* of his *objective certainty of salvation* (vers. 6–11). The thesis from which he proceeds is the fact that, among men, there is scarcely one who will die for a righteous man, though perhaps one would die for the good man (see the *Exeg. Notes;* comp. Tholuck, p. 208). The sentence must be enlarged by the farther definition: No one would die for the ungodly, or for his enemy; but God has performed this miracle of love in the death of Christ. For Christ died for us when we were, in a negative view, incapable, and, in a positive view, even ungodly. Therefore the objective certainty of salvation is established in the following conclusions: (1.) We were sinners, debtors, for whom Christ *died;* much more shall we, since we are justified and reconciled, be preserved from the wrath to come. (2.) The death of the Son of God has overcome our enmity, and reconciled us; much more shall His life perfectly redeem us as reconciled until the consummation. (3.) Since we have obtained reconciliation, we are happy even now in the triumphant joy that God is our God.

12. On the difference between the ἱλασμός and the καταλλαγή, see the *Exeg. Notes* [p. 166].

[Bishop Horsley (Serm. on Rom. iv. 25) on the atonement and reconciliation: "Those who speak of *the wrath of God* as appeased by Christ's sufferings, speak, it must be confessed, a figurative language. The Scriptures speak figuratively when they ascribe wrath to God. The Divine nature is insusceptible of the perturbations of passion, and, when it is said that God is angry, it is a figure, which conveys this useful warning to mankind, that God will be determined by His wisdom, and by His providential care of His creation, to deal with the wicked, as a prince in anger deals with rebellious subjects. It is an extension of the figure when it is said that God's wrath is appeased by the sufferings of Christ. It is not to be supposed that the sins of men excite in God an appetite of vengeance, which could not be diverted from its purpose of punishment till it had found its gratification in the sufferings of a righteous person. This, indeed, were a view of our redemption founded on a false and unworthy notion of the Divine character. But nothing hinders but that the sufferings of Christ, which could only, in a figurative sense, be an appeasement or satisfaction of God's wrath, might be, in the most literal meaning of the words, a satisfaction to His justice. It is easy to understand that the interests of God's government, the peace and order of the great kingdom, over which He rules the whole world of moral agents, might require that His disapprobation of sin should be solemnly declared and testified in His manner of forgiving it. It is easy to understand that the exaction of vicarious sufferings on the part of Him, who undertook to be the intercessor for a rebellious race, amounted to such a declaration. These sufferings, by which the end of punishment might be answered, being once sustained, it is easy to perceive that the same principle of wisdom, the same providential care of His creation, which must have determined the Deity to inflict punishment, had no atonement been made, would now determine Him to spare. Thus, to speak figuratively, His anger was appeased; but His justice was literally satisfied, and the sins of men, no longer calling for punishment, when the ends of punishment were secured, were literally expiated. The person sustaining the sufferings, in consideration of which the guilit of others may, consistently with the principles of good policy, be remitted, was, in the literal sense of the word—so literally, as no other victim ever was—a sacrifice, and His blood shed for the remission of sin was literally the matter of expiation."]

13. This section contains, in narrow compass, a sketch of *the whole development of Christian salvation*, in which its *principial* perfection* is made emphatic at the beginning as well as at the conclusion, in order that the *peripherical* imperfection of the state of faith in this world may not be regarded in an Ebionitic way as a principial one. We must observe that, in Rom. viii., this designation is further elaborated under a new point of view, and that there, too, the *subjective* and *objective* certainty of salvation can be distinguished.

14. The idea of the real worship of God reappears definitely here in the beginning as well as at the end of the section.

* [PRINCIPIELLE *Vollkommenheit*, perfection as a principle. The word *principial* (from *principium*), in the sense of *initial, elementary, fundamental,* though now obsolete, is used by Bacon. In German, the word is almost indispensable.—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The fruits of the righteousness of faith. They are: 1. Peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ (ver. 1); 2. Hope of *future* glory in the tribulations of the present time (vers. 2–5); 3. Confidence of salvation established on the love of God for us as made known in the propitiatory death of Christ (vers. 6–11).—Peace with God: 1. In what does it consist? 2. By whom do we obtain it? (ver. 1).—The peace of heart with God is the source of all other peace: 1. In homes; 2. In churches; 3. In nations.—By Christ we have obtained access to the grace of justification. In this are comprised: 1. A strong consolation (we are no more rejected from God's face; the door is opened; we can come in); 2. A serious admonition (we should not disregard this access, but make use of it; and 3. We should often come with all our burdens.).—In what should and can we glory as Christians? 1. In the future glory which God shall give; 2. But also in the tribulations which He sends us (vers. 2–5); 3. In God Himself as our God.—Why should we, as Christians, glory also in tribulations? Because we know: 1. That tribulation worketh patience (endurance); 2. Patience (endurance) worketh experience (strictly, approval); comp. 2 Cor. ii. 9; ix. 13; James i. 3); 3. Experience (approval) worketh hope; and 4. Hope maketh not ashamed (vers. 2–5).—Why does Christian hope prevent shame? 1. Because it is not a false hope; but, 2. It has its ground in the love of God, which is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us (ver. 5).—In what respect does God commend (prove) His love toward us? 1. In Christ's *dying* at the appointed time for us; 2. But still more in His dying for us when we were yet *sinners* (vers. 6–8).—It is *noble* to die for a benefactor, but it is *divine* to die for evil-doers (ver. 7).—The importance of Christ's life and death for men: 1. His death brings reconciliation when we are enemies; 2. His life brings salvation when we are reconciled (vers. 9–11).—Christ's *life* our salvation (ver. 10).—Salvation by the *life* of Christ is necessary for Christians of the present time.—Let us speak of Christ's death, but let us also speak continually of His life (ver. 10).

LUTHER: One has experience when he has been well tempted, and can therefore speak of it as having been in it himself (ver. 4).—God is our God, and we are His people, and we have all good things in common from Him and with Him, in all confidence (ver. 11).

STARKE: Ver. 2. Future glory is connected with justification by an indissoluble chain; chap. viii. 18, 30, 32.—Ver. 2. Nothing can make so happy as the hope of the incorruptible, undefiled, and imperishable inheritance which is reserved in heaven; 1 Peter i. 4.—Ver. 5. He who has the Holy Spirit, is the only one who is certain that God's love is shed abroad in his heart.—Ver. 10. The death of Christ is the principal agency toward our reconciliation; but His resurrection is the seal and assurance that we are truly reconciled to God.—Ver. 10. Christ's resurrection is the ark of life and royal city of our salvation.—Ver. 11. No one can glory in God but he who has Christ; for He is the way by which we come to the enjoyment of God; John xiv. 6. He,

therefore, who does not have Him, is also without God in the world, Eph. ii. 12.—HEDINGER: To be certain of the forgiveness of sin, is the fountain of all joy and consolation (ver. 1).—Beware of the hypocrite's hope, which destroys! The believer clings to God's love in Christ as an anchor to the rock; Heb. vi. 19. Would to God we understood this well! If we did, nothing could grieve and fflict us (ver. 5).—A Christian must regard the suffering of Christ not only as a mirror of wrath, but also as a mirror of love (ver. 8).—What a glory! God's child, and in good favor with Him! How incomprehensible, how glorious, and how blessed! (ver. 11).—CRAMER: If we are justified by faith, we have free access to God, so that we do not need any patron or saint to prepare the way for us (ver. 2).—The suffering of Christians is their glory; for they suffer without guilt, and for Christ's glory (ver. 3).—OSIANDER: The cross and tribulation make us humble and patient; they are therefore the most precious gems and best ornament of the children of God (ver. 3).—*Nova Bibl. Tub.*: Oh, how blessed is the cross! Though it pain the flesh, it brings eternal good. We are better purified by it, than gold is by fire; our hope is strengthened, and the love of God is shed abroad in the heart (ver. 5).—Love is rare among men, yet there are remarkable examples of some who have given up their lives for their fellow-citizens and brethren. But there is no comparison between all this and the love of Christ (ver. 7).—Who would not love in return a God so full of love, and prefer fellowship with Him to that of all others? (ver. 10).

GERLACH: Justification by faith not only gives free access to God's grace at the present time, but it also confers the certainty of future glory (ver. 2).—In justification the believer receives the first germ of the whole new life. But since the germ grows into a tree, and the tree ever becomes more firmly rooted amid storms, all that the believer had at the beginning is renewed and established at every new stage of trial (ver. 5).—Since God has performed for *sinners* and *enemies* the *greatest service*, He will certainly not leave unfinished for the *reconciled* and *righteous* the much *smaller* remaining part of His work (ver. 9).—The Apostle begins to indicate here what he treats more at length in chap. vi.: Faith so transposes us into Christ, that His life, death, resurrection, and glory, become ours. Each circumstance from His history becomes the history of mankind believing in Him, as well as of each individual believer (ver. 10).

LISCO: The saving fruits of the righteousness acquired by faith in Jesus Christ (vers. 1–11).—The fruit of this righteousness (vers. 1–5).—The most certain sign of the love of God toward us just mentioned, is the redemption made by Christ (vers. 6–8).—The blessed result of this love of God and Christ, is the certain hope of the eternal duration of this love, and, finally, of our attainment of glory (vers. 9–11).

HEUBNER: Paul here strikes the note of the triumphal song of the justified. Listen: His readers should participate in his joy; we are reconciled, we are pardoned.—Without justification, there is no joy, no love, no happiness in life; without it, nothing can make us happy—neither nature, nor the love of men (ver. 1).—Grace is prepared, and offered to all. Many accept it, but all do not remain steadfast (ver. 2).—He on whom God has placed many burdens, has much entrusted to him; God has made him an object of distinction. Therefore, the higher and more joyous the Christian's spirit is in suffering, the greater will be the increase of his joy and strength in conflict (ver. 3).—What influence does suffering exert on the Christian? (ver. 3).—The *sacred* hope of the Christian maketh not ashamed; it is holy in its object and ground.—Faith in the love of God is the ground of all hope (ver. 5).—The helplessness of the unimproved heart is followed by the saddest results of sin; just as severe sickness is succeeded by weakness (ver. 6).—God's holy love of His enemies (ver. 8).—The greatest misery of a created being, is, to bear the wrath of God (ver. 9).—God's love of us is a prevenient love (ver. 10).—Christ's life is the ground of our salvation (ver. 10).

BESSER: The salvation of those who are justified by faith. It is: 1. A present salvation; 2. Also a future one (vers. 1–11).—Tribulation is praiseworthy, because the evergreen of hope is sprinkled with the tears of tribulation (vers. 3–5).—God's wrath is not human; God is love, and Divine wrath is connected with the love which takes no pleasure in the death of the sinner, but is an ardent, compassionate desire to save the sinner. *Reconciliation* is the execution of this loving determination of God by means of the atonement *through the death of His Son* (ver. 10).—God unites in the Church with pardoned sinners—who have faith in Jesus, and glory in God as their God—more intimately and gloriously than in Paradise with innocent man (ver. 11).

SCHLEIERMACHER, on vers. 7, 8: The death of Christ is the highest glorification of God's love toward us. 1. God imposed death on our Redeemer as the most perfect proof of obedience; 2. Many are justified by this obedience.

SPENER: 1. The fruits of justification: (*a.*) Peace; (*b.*) Access to God; (*c.*) The joy of future hope; (*d.*) Victory in tribulation and the cross; (*e.*) The gift of the Holy Ghost. 2. The causes of justification (vers. 1–11).

[BURKITT: One grace generates and begets another; graces have a generation one from another, though they all have one generation from the Spirit of God.—He that does not seek reconciliation with God, is an enemy of his soul; and he that rejoices not in that reconciliation, is an enemy to his own comfort.—LOGAN (sermon on *Jesus Christ Dying for Sinners*, Rom. v. 7, 8): The greatest trial and exercise of virtue is when an innocent man submits to the imputation of a crime, that others may be free from the punishment. This Christ did. He was betrayed like an impostor by one of His own disciples, apprehended like a robber by a band of soldiers, led like a malefactor through the streets of Jerusalem, nailed like a murderer to the accursed tree, and, in the sight of all Israel, died the death of a traitor and a slave, that he might atone for the real guilt of men.—*Comp. Comm.*: He that puts himself to the charge of purchasing our salvation, will not decline the trouble of applying it.—HODGE: As the love of God in the gift of His Son, and the love of Christ in dying for us, are the peculiar characteristics of the gospel, no one can be a true Christian on whom these truths do not exert a governing influence.—*Annot. Paragraph Bible*: God establishes His love toward man by demonstration; it is a love worthy of Himself, and which none but Himself can feel.

Comp. CHRYSOSTOM, *De Gloria in Tribulationibus*; ARCHBISHOP USHER, *Four Sermons*, *Works*, vol. xiii. 226; JOHN HOWE, *Influence of Hope*, *Works*, vol. vi. 277; BISHOP MANT, *The Love of God the*

Motive to Man's Salvation, Sermons, vol. i. 115; JONATHAN EDWARDS, *Men naturally God's Enemies, Works*, vol. ii. 180.—*On the Section vers.* 1–5, see NATH. HORNES, *The Bracelet of Pearl of Sanctifying Graces, Works*, 207; RICHARD BAXTER, *Short Meditations, Works*, vol. xviii. 508; C. SIMEON *Benefits arising from a Justifying Faith, Works* vol. xv. 116; J. MORGAN, *The Hidden Life Disclosed in Rom.* v. 1–5, an Exposition, Belfast, 1854 —J. F. H.]

SECOND DIVISION.

SIN AND GRACE IN THEIR SECOND ANTITHESIS (AS IN THEIR SECOND POTENCY): ACCORDING TO THEIR NATURAL EFFECTS IN HUMAN NATURE, AND IN NATURE IN GENERAL. THE SINFUL CORRUPTION OF THE WORLD, PROCEEDING FROM ADAM, AND INHERITED IN COMMON BY ALL MEN, AND THE LIFE OF CHRIST AS THE INWARD LIVING PRINCIPLE OF THE NEW BIRTH TO NEW LIFE IN INDIVIDUAL BELIEVERS, IN ALL MANKIND, AND IN THE WHOLE CREATED WORLD. (THE PRINCIPLE OF DEATH IN SIN, AND THE PRINCIPLE OF THE NEW LIFE; AS WELL AS THE GLORIFICATION OF THE NEW LIFE, AND OF ALL NATURE, IN RIGHTEOUSNESS.)

CHAPTERS V. 12–VIII. 39.

FIRST SECTION.—*Adam's sin as the powerful principle of death, and God's grace in Christ as the more powerful principle of the new life in the nature of individual men, and in mankind collectively. The law as the direct medium of the complete manifestation of sin for the indirect mediation of the completed and glorious revelation of grace.*

CHAP. V. 12–21.

12 Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin;
and so death[1] passed upon all men, for that [ἐφ' ᾧ, *i. e.*, on the ground that, because]
13 all have [*omit* have] sinned: ([*omit* parenthesis][2] For until the law sin was in the
world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law [where the law is not].
14 Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not
sinned [those that sinned not][3] after the similitude [likeness] of Adam's trans-
gression, who is the figure [a type] of him that was to come [the coming one,
15 *i. e.*, the second Adam]. But not as the offence [fall, transgression],[4] so also *is* the
free gift: for if through the offence [transgression] of [the] one [the] many
be dead [died], much more [did][5] the grace of God, and the gift by grace,
which is by one man [the gift by the grace of the one man], Jesus Christ, hath
16 abounded [abound] unto [the] many. And not as *it was* [*omit it was*] by [the]
one that sinned,[6] *so* [*omit so*] *is* the gift: for the judgment *was* [*came*] by
[ἐξ, of] one (*fall*) to condemnation, but the free gift *is* [*came*] of many
offences [falls, transgressions] unto justification [δικαίωμα, sentence of acquittal,
17 righteous decree, *or*, righteous act]. For if by one man's offence [by one trans-
gression, *or*, by the transgression of the one][7] death reigned by [through the]
one; much more they which [who] receive [the] abundance of [the] grace
and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by [the] one, Jesus Christ.)
18 [*omit* parenthesis.] Therefore, as by the offence of one *judgment came* upon all
men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one *the free gift came*
upon all men unto justification of life [So then, as through the transgression
of one, *or*, one transgression, it came upon all men to condemnation; so also
through the δικαιώματος, righteous act of one, *or*, one righteous act, it came
19 upon all men unto justification of life].[8] For as by one man's disobedience
[through the disobedience of the one man] [the] many were made [consti-
tuted][9] sinners, so [also, οὕτως καί] by the obedience of [the] one shall [the]
20 many be made [constituted] righteous. Moreover the law entered [came in
besides],[10] that the offence [transgression] might abound [multiply]. But where

21 sin abounded [multiplied], grace did much more [exceedingly][11] abound: That as sin hath [*omit* hath] reigned unto [ἐν, in] death, even so [so also] might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by [through] Jesus Christ our Lord.

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 12.—[Ὁ θάνατος (*Rec.*) is found in ℵ. B. C. K. L, some versions and fathers; is adopted by Lachmann, Meyer, Wordsworth, and Lange. Tischendorf and Alford omit it, on the authority of D. E. F. G., and many fathers Alford considers it a marginal gloss, to define the subject of διῆλθεν. But the external authority for it is sufficient to overcome the doubt arising from the variation in position found in some authorities, especially as the omission may have readily arisen from the transcriber's mistaking -ους, which precedes, for the close of the word he was about to write: -τος (Meyer).

[2] Ver. 13.—[*On the parenthesis of the E. V.* This is to be omitted; for, although it might be a help to the ordinary reader, it is inserted on the view that ver. 18 is strictly resumptive, which is not in accordance with Lange's exegesis. Even were it the case, vers. 13–17 comprise an argument so important, that it does not deserve the subordination implied in a parenthesis. The E. V. is frequently unfortunate in this regard: *e. g.*, Gal. i. 7, where the very theme of the Epistle is put in parenthesis.

[3] Ver. 14.—[Some cursives and fathers omit μή. This probably arose from a wish to make this verse correspond with ver. 12, the meaning of which was misunderstood. There is no question as to the correctness of its insertion.—The pluperfect of the E. V. is to be changed to the simple past: *sinned*, as a more correct rendering of the aorist participle. The other emendations are not absolutely necessary, but are offered as more literal, and perhaps preferable for other reasons.

[4] Ver. 15.—[The word παράπτωμα, occurring five times in this section, is rendered *offence* in the E. V.; by the Amer. Bible Union: *trespass*. Both are etymologically correct, but more modern usage compels us to reject *offence*. *Trespass* would be preferable to *transgression*, on the ground that παράβασις (ver. 14) must also be rendered by the latter word; yet *trespass* has at present a technical meaning, which is legal, *transgression* being more theological. The very slight distinction between παράβασις and παράπτωμα is sufficiently implied in the clauses where the words occur. Lange renders the latter: *Sündenfall, fall*, to distinguish it from παράβασις, *Uebertretung*, ver. 14.

[5] Ver. 15.—[The aorist, ἐπερίσσευσεν, is to be rendered *did abound*, and the auxiliary *did* placed after *much more*, as indicating more plainly that *much more* is rather quantitative than logical.—The articles are unfortunately omitted throughout in the E. V.; *the one, the many*, express the definiteness of the Greek.

[6] Ver. 16.—[Lange adopts the reading ἁμαρτήματος (D. E. F. G., some fathers, cursives, and versions, Griesbach), urging that it is required as an antithesis to παραπτωμάτων. But this is the very reason for deeming it a gloss. Ἁμαρτήσαντος is found in ℵ. A. B. C. K. L., adopted by Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth.

[7] Ver. 17.—[The two renderings correspond to two various readings; in any case, *man's*, of E. V., must be rejected. A. F. G. have ἐν ἑνὶ παραπτώματι (D. E., ἐν τῷ ἑνὶ π.); adopted by Griesbach, Tischendorf, Meyer, Lange. ℵ. B. C. K. L., many versions and fathers, read τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι; adopted by Lachmann, Alford, and Wordsworth. It is a question which is correct, but Meyer's explanation is most satisfactory. He considers the former reading the original one, "because thus the origin of the other variations are very naturally explained. For more definite description the article was added by some (D. E.); by others, ἑνί was changed into ἑνός. But since, at all events, the sense was the same as τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς π. (ver. 15), this was at first added as a parallel passage, and then received into the text."

[8] Ver. 18.—[The questions respecting the changes to be made in this verse are exegetical. It is only necessary to note here, that the above rendering indicates the doubt as to the precise meaning of δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος, and δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος; leaving the subjects indefinite (instead of retaining the italicized glosses of the E. V.). Lange supplies παράπτωμα and δικαίωμα. On all the points, see *Exeg. Notes*.

[9] Ver. 19.—[So Amer. Bible Union. Lange: *herausgestellt*. The rendering given above is correct; any dogmatic questions that arise cannot affect this.

[10] Ver. 20.—[Παρεισῆλθεν, only Gal. ii. 4; there, *in malam partem*. The above rendering is literal and exact. Lange translates: *came in between*. See *Exeg. Notes*.

[11] Ver. 20.—[Alford suggests that words compounded with ὑπέρ have a *superlative*, not a comparative force.—The change in the first verb in English is to indicate that two different words are used in Greek.—R.]

[The following is the Greek text of this section, in parallelistic arrangement, from Forbes:

12. A {
Ὥσπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου
ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν,
καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος,
καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν,
ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον·

13. B {
ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ,
ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου·
14. ἀλλὰ ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωυσέως
καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ·

C { ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος.

D { Points of disparity in the comparison
D { stated in vers. 15, 16, 17.

18. *C* { Justification. {
Ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος
εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα,
οὕτως καὶ δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος
εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς·

19. Sanctification. {
ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου
ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί,
οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς
δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί.

20. *B* {
Νόμος δὲ παρεισῆλθεν,
ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα·
οὗ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία,
ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις,

21. *A* {
ἵνα ὥσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία
ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ,
οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης
εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον
διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

[SPECIAL LITERATURE ON CHAP. V. 12-21.—S. J. BAUMGARTEN, *De imputatione peccati Adamitici posteris facta*, 1742. S. SCHOTT, *Opuscula*, i. p. 313 sqq. C. F. SCHMID, *Ueber Röm. V. 12 ff.*, in the *Tübing. Zeitschrift* for 1830, No. IV. p. 161 ff. (A very able and sound discussion. Comp. the same author's *Bibl. Theologie des N. T.*, vol. ii. pp. 256-262.) RICH. ROTHE (died 1868), *Neuer Versuch einer Auslegung der Paulin. Stelle Röm. V. 12-21*, Wittenberg, 1836. (A masterpiece of exegetical acuteness and finesse.) I. CHR. K. v. HOFMANN, *Der Schriftbeweis*, 2d ed., Nördlingen, 1857, vol. i. pp. 524-541. JUL. MÜLLER, *Christl. Lehre von der Sünde*, vol. ii. p. 407 ff., 472 ff., 3d Germ. ed., 1849. H. EWALD, *Adam und Christus, Röm. V. 12-21*, in his *Jahrbücher für bibl. Wissenschaft*, ii. p. 166 ff. TIMOTHY DWIGHT (of Yale College), *Princeton Exegesis. A Review of Dr. Hodge's Commentary on Romans V. 12-19*, in the *New Englander* for July, 1868, pp. 551-603. (Polemical against Hodge). A. STÖLTING, *Beiträge zur Exegese der Paulin. Briefe*, Gött., 1869, pp. 1-42. REICHE, OLSHAUSEN, THOLUCK, STUART, HODGE, and FORBES, are most full, though widely divergent, in the exposition of this passage, which many regard as the most difficult in the whole Bible.—P. S.]

[INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.—This section is difficult in proportion to its depth, grandeur, and world-historical comprehensiveness. Only a mind of the very highest order—to say nothing of inspiration—could conceive such vast thoughts, and compress them within so few words. The beginning, the middle, and the end of history, are here brought together in their representative moral powers and principles. Paul deals with religious truths and facts, which are much broader and deeper than the afterthoughts of our logic and theology, and cannot be squeezed into the narrow limits of particular schools and schemes. The exegesis of this part of the Romans began in earnest with Augustine, in his contest with the Pelagian heresy; it was resumed in the Reformation period, and carried further, philologically and doctrinally, in the present century, but is by no means exhausted, and puts exegetical skill again and again to the severest test. Every line bears the marks of theological controversy about original sin, free agency, imputation, limited atonement, universal salvation, and other questions which will occupy the human mind to the end of the world. The section is not a mere episode, but a progress in the argument from the doctrine of justification to the broader doctrine of a *life-union of the believer with Christ*, which prepares the way for the doctrine of sanctification, in chap. vi., and glorification, in chap. viii. Like a skilful physician, the Apostle goes not only to the root and fountain-head of the evil,* but also to the root and fountain head of the cure. In bold antithetical contrasts, and on the basis of a vital, organic union of humanity, both in the order of fallen nature and the order of redeeming grace, he presents the history of the fall by the first, and the redemption by the second Adam. Adam and Christ are the two representative heads of the whole race, the one the natural, the other the supernatural: from the one, the power of sin and the power of death have proceeded upon all men through their participation in his fall; from the other, righteousness and life have come upon all on condition of faith, or a living apprehension of Christ. But the gain by the redemption greatly surpasses the loss by the fall. The main stress lies on the idea of *life* in its progress from Christ to the believer. The same parallelism between the first and second Adam, but with exclusive reference to the contrast of death and the resurrection, occurs in 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22, 45-48, which should be kept in view. It is impossible to understand this section from the standpoint of a mechanical and atomistic conception of humanity and of sin, such as Pelagianism and cognate systems maintain. On the surface, all things appear separate and isolated; in the hidden roots, they are united. It is characteristic of all deep thinking, to go back to principles and general ideas. Paul evidently views the human race as an organic unit. Adam and Christ sustain to it a central and universal relation, similar to that which the fountain sustains to the river, or the root to the tree and its branches. Adam was not merely an individual, but the natural head of the human family, and his transgression was not an isolated act, but affected the whole race which sprung from his loins; just as the character of the tree will determine the character of its branches and fruits. So it is with Christ. He calls himself emphatically *the* (not *a*) Son of Man, the universal, normal, absolute Man, the representative head of regenerate humanity, which is from heaven, heavenly, as Adam's fallen humanity is "of the earth, earthy" (1 Cor. xv. 47, 48). Both were tried and tempted by the devil, the one in the garden of innocence, the other in the desert; but the one succumbed, and dragged his posterity into the ruin of the fall; while the other conquered, and became the author of righteousness and life to all who embrace Him. Christ has gained far more for us than Adam lost—namely, eternal reunion with God, in the place of the temporary union of untried innocence. The resurrection of humanity in Christ is the glorious solution of the dark tragedy of the disastrous fall of humanity in Adam. In view of the greater merit of Christ and the paradise in heaven, we may reverently and thankfully rejoice in the guilt of Adam and the loss of his paradise on earth—always, of course, detesting the blasphemous maxim: Let us do evil, that good may come. It is God's infinite wisdom and mercy alone which overrule the wrath of man for His own glory.—P. S.]

Meyer inscribes this section: The drawing of a parallel between salvation in Christ and the ruin produced by Adam. But this does not do justice to the context of the section. Tholuck adopts Bengel's view: "*Respicit totam tractationem superiorem, ex qua hæc infert apostolus, non tam digressionem faciens quam regressum de peccato et de justitia.*" [Bengel continues: "In imitation of Paul's method, we should treat first of actual sin (chaps. i.-iii.), and then go back to the source in which sin originated." Philippi also regards this section as a comparative or contrastive retrospect and comprehensive conclusion; De Wette and Rothe as an episode.—P. S.] We differ from all these, and refer to our division of the Epistle, and to the superscription here.

1. The principle of sin and death become immanent (hereditary) in humanity (vers. 12-14).

2. The opposing principle of the gift of grace and of the new life made immanent (spiritually hereditary) in humanity (vers. 15-19).

3. The coöperation of the law for the finished revelation of sin and for the communication of the finished revelation of the grace of justification (vers. 20, 21).

1. Arrangement of the first paragraph, vers 12-14.

(*a*.) Sin and death proceeding from Adam's

* [As Chrysostom remarks in the beginning of his tenth Homily on Romans, *Opera*, tom. ix. p. 519, ed. Montfaucon, but he omits the positive part, which is more important.—P. S.]

παράβασις upon all, under the form of an ethical appropriation by all (ver. 12).

(*b.*) Death as revealer of the improperly apprehended sin, from Adam to Moses, or to the law (not by the law, vers. 13, 14).

2. The second paragraph, vers. 15–19.

(*a.*) The actually manifested contrast in the effects of the two principles. (*aa.*) The contrast between the natural and actual effects, according to their quantitative extension to persons; or the contrast *in its personal relation* (ver. 15). (*bb.*) The contrast between the positive effects, according to the qualitative intensity of judgment and justification; or, the contrast *in its essential relation* (ver. 16).

(*b*). The contrast in the potential and prospective effects of the two principles. (*aa.*) The contrast between the enslavemment of all personal life by impersonal (merely personified) death, and the future glory of the pardoned, immortal, and reigning personalities in the new life (ver. 17, at the same time a proof for ver. 16). (*bb.*) The contrast in all its ideal magnitude: One condemnation came upon all men, because of the power of the fall of one man; so, by the righteousness of one, can all men attain to the justification of life (that is, not merely of faith, ver. 18).

(*c.*) The contrast in the final effects disclosed by the gospel. By the effect of one man's disobedience, the many are represented in the light of the gospel as sinners exposed to the judgment; finally, by the obedience of one, the many are to be represented as righteous in the judgment (ver. 19).

3. Third paragraph, vers. 20–21.

The law is designed to effect directly the developing process of sin to historical completion, in order to effect indirectly that revelation of grace which far preponderates over the development of sin (vers. 20, 21).

FIRST PARAGRAPH (VERS. 12–14).

The principle of sin and death in humanity.

Ver. 12. **Wherefore** [*Διὰ τοῦτο*]. Rückert, Köllner [Tholuck, Reiche, Stuart], &c., refer *διὰ τοῦτο* to the entire discussion from chap. i. 17;* Rothe, to the previous section, v. 1–11, which he claims to treat of holiness; Tholuck, to vers. 11, 10, 9, &c.; Meyer, to ver. 11 alone.† We refer it merely to *ἐλάβομεν* in the previous verse. The verb *λαμβάνειν* does not denote, in the New Testament, a passive reception, but an ethical, religious, and moral appropriation; for example, John i. 12. And this is here the point of comparison between vers. 11 and 12.

Because this point has been overlooked, an incredible amount of vexation has been produced in reference to the presumed anacoluthon, or *ἀναντα-πόδοτον* [an incomplete sentence, a protasis without an apodosis]. Conjectures [concerning the construction or the apodosis corresponding to *ὥσπερ, like as*]:

1. According to Calvin, Tholuck, Philippi, and others, the conclusion is indicated in the words *ὅς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος*, ver. 14. [Meyer also regards the clause: "who is a type of the future (Adam)," as a substitute for the apodosis, which was swept away by the current of ideas in vers. 13 and 14.—P. S.]

2. According to Rückert, Fritzsche, and De Wette [?], Paul dropped the comparison between Adam and Christ after enumerating the points of analogy, because their dissimilarity occurred to his mind (ver. 15). De Wette translates ver. 12: Therefore (is it) as by one man, &c. According to Origen, Bengel [Rothe], and others, the Apostle designedly suppresses the conclusion. [Bengel says simply: "*Apodosis, variata oratione, latet in seq.*," is *concealed* in what follows. But Rothe holds that Paul *designedly* omitted the apodosis, to prevent the illegitimate doctrinal inference of a universal salvation. See below.—P. S.]

3. According to Grotius, [E. V., Stuart, Barnes, Hodge], &c., vers. 13–17 are parenthetical; and the conclusion follows in ver. 18. [Against this construction may be urged, with Meyer, the unexampled length and importance of the supposed parenthesis, and that ver. 18 is not so much a reassumption as a recapitulation.—P. S.]

4. According to Clericus, Wolf, and others, the conclusion is already in ver. 12, and begins with *καὶ οὕτως* [as if this could be synonymous with *οὕτω καί, so also*, which is impossible.—P. S.]; according to Erasmus, Beza, and others, it begins with *καὶ διά* [which makes *διὰ τοῦτο* superfluous, and sets aside the comparison between Adam and Christ.—P. S.]

5. The proper view is the one defended by Koppe, in harmony with [Cocceius] Elsner, and others. The apodosis begins as a comparative statement with *ὥσπερ*, since *ἐλάβομεν καταλλαγὴν δι' αὐτοῦ* is brought over from ver. 11. [In other words, *ὥσπερ* introduces the *second* member of the comparison, while the *first* must be supplied from ver. 11 in this way: Therefore (we received and appropriated the reconciliation through Christ in the same manner) as by one man sin entered into the world, &c.—P. S.]*

* [So also Bengel: "*διὰ τοῦτο* refers to the whole of the preceding discussion, from which the Apostle draws these conclusions, herein making not so much a digression as a retrogression." Hodge: "The *wherefore* is to be taken as illative, or marking an inference from the *whole* of the previous part of the Epistle, and especially from the preceding verses."—P. S.]

† [Meyer: "DARUM, *weil wir nämlich durch Christum die καταλλαγή und die Gewissheit des ewigen Heils empfangen haben*, ver. 11." But Meyer regards ver. 11 as the summary of the whole preceding doctrine of justification and salvation. Philippi likewise refers *διὰ τοῦτο* to ver. 11 in such a way that it looks at the same time to the whole deduction from i. 17–v. 11. This to us seems to be the most satisfactory connection.—P. S.]

* [This construction is favored, upon the whole, by De Wette (who, however, objects to it: "*Ergänzt man τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν δι' αὐτοῦ, so weiss man nicht recht, was man mit der Vergleichung anfangen soll*") Umbreit, Theo. Schott, Wordsworth, Alford, Jowett, Conybeare and Howson. I subjoin Alford's note in full, though I dissent from it: "This verse is one of acknowledged difficulty. The two questions meeting us directly, are: (1.) To what does *διὰ τοῦτο* refer? (2.) *ὥσπερ, like as*, may introduce the first member of a comparison, the second being to be discovered; or may introduce the second, the first having to be discovered. I shall endeavor to answer both questions in connection. I conceive *διὰ τοῦτο* to refer to that blessed state of confidence and hope just described: 'on this account,' here meaning, '*quæ cum ita sint*:' 'this state of things, thus brought about, will justify the following analogy.' Thus we must take *ὥσπερ*, either (*α*) as beginning the comparison, and then supply, 'so by Christ, in His resurrection, came justification into the world; and by justification, life;' or (*β*) as concluding the comparison, and supply before it, 'it was,' or 'Christ wrought.' This latter method seems to me far the best. For none of the endeavors of commentators to supply the second limb of the comparison from the following verses has succeeded: and we can hardly suppose such an ellipsis, when the next following comparison (ver. 16) is rather

Tholuck remarks, that then we do not know exactly what to do with the comparison.† But the comparison is contained in the already indicated conception of the ethical appropriation of the principle of the reconciliation on one hand, as of the principle of sin and death on the other. The antithesis, more fully extended, is the following: *Διὰ τοῦτο ἐλάβομεν τὴν καταλλαγήν, ἐφ' ᾧ πεπιστεύκαμεν—ὥσπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως ὁ θάνατος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους διῆλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον.* It is very plain that, without the conception of *λαμβάνειν*, the whole of the following antitheses would appear as a series of blind natural necessities; see Book of Wisdom i. 16; ii. 24, and the explanation of *ἐφ' ᾧ*, which follows below. Rothe thinks that the Apostle's supposed anacoluthon was even premeditated—according to the idea of Origen—in order to conceal the doctrine of the apocatastasis which might be deduced from the protasis. See thereon Tholuck, p. 215.

[I cannot bring my mind to adopt Dr. Lange's construction, which evades a grammatical difficulty only to give room for a more serious logical one, and mars the beauty and completeness of the analogy. It seems to me that the most natural solution of the difficulty is either (1.) to take *ὥσπερ* elliptically: "This is therefore like the case when;" comp. Matt. xxv. 14: *ὥσπερ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος*, *as a man going abroad*, where *ὥσπερ* neither has, nor necessarily requires, a corresponding *οὕτως* (see *Textual Note* in the Amer. edition of Lange on *Matthew*, p. 442); Gal. iii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 3, where *καθώς*, and Mark xiii. 34, where *ὡς* is used elliptically; or (2.) to assume an *intentional* anacoluthon (comp. Winer, *Gramm.*, p. 527 ff., on the two kinds of anacolutha, involuntary and intentional). I prefer the latter solution. The complete antithesis would read thus: "As (*ὥσπερ*) by one man (Adam) sin (*ἡ ἁμαρτία*) entered into the world, and death (*ὁ θάνατος*) through sin, and thus death extended (*διῆλθεν*) to all men, inasmuch as all sinned (*ἥμαρτον*): *so also* (*οὕτως καί*) *by one man, Jesus Christ, righteousness* (*ἡ δικαιοσύνη*) *entered into the world, and life* (*ἡ ζωή*) *through righteousness, and thus life shall extend* (*διελεύσεται*) *to all men, inasmuch as (on condition that) all shall believe* (*πιστεύσονται*)." We might also supply, after the second "righteousness": "*in order that all, being justified by faith, may be saved.*" Rothe (p. 61) supplies as the last clause of the apodosis: *ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται*; Philippi: *ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες δικαιωθήσονται*. But these are unessential differences. The great points of comparison are: (1.) Sin and death, as a principle and power, proceeding from Adam; righteousness and life, as a counteracting and conquering principle and power, proceeding from Christ, upon the whole human race. (2.) Death passing upon all men by participation in the sin of Adam; life passing upon all men by participation in the righteousness of Christ. But the analogy is not absolute; for (1.) the participation in Adam's sin is universal in fact, while the participation in the righteousness of Christ, though this righteousness is equally universal in power and intention, is limited in fact to believers; in other words, all are sinners, but not all are believers; all men are one with Adam, but not all are one with Christ (hence the past tense *κατεστάθησαν* in the case of the *ἁμαρτωλοί*, but the future *κατασταθήσονται* in the case of the *δίκαιοι*, ver. 19). (2.) What Christ gained for us is far greater (*πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐπερίσσευσεν*, ver. 15, comp. *τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος*, ver. 17, and *ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις*, ver. 20) than what was lost by Adam. Paul, therefore, in the rush of ideas suggested by the parallel, intentionally suspends the apodosis, to make first some explanatory and qualifying statements in regard to the difference in the mode, extent, and quality of the effects proceeding respectively from Adam and Christ, and then, after hinting at the second member of the comparison, at the close of ver. 14, he brings out the double parallel of similarity and dissimilarity in full as a conclusion, vers. 18, 19, and 21. The whole section, as Meyer justly remarks, bears the impress of the most studied and acute premeditation; and this must apply also to the apparent grammatical irregularity in the absence of the apodosis. The Apostle might have spared the commentators a great deal of trouble, if he had, according to the ordinary rules of composition, first stated the comparison in full, and then given the explanations and qualifications; but such grammatical difficulties in the Scriptures are generally overruled for a profounder investigation and elucidaton of the sense.—P. S.]

As by one man [*ὥσπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου*, "by one man, single and singular in his position, and so presented as the *τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος*, the type of the one greater man;" Webster and Wilkinson.—P. S.] Not *by his guilt* (Meyer) [*δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος*, ver. 16], which would by no means suit the antithesis: *Christ*. But rather by one man, as the human principle, as the historical cause.* The one man is Adam, as representative of the first human pair in their unity. The sin of Eve (Sir. xxv. 24; 2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 14) did not fully decide concerning the future of the human race, because Adam was the head. It was with his sin that the sin of Eve was consummated as the guilt of the first man [and acquired its full power over posterity]. Therefore Adam is meant as the head, as the principle, and not merely with regard to propagation. [Webster and Wilkinson: "Adam, not Eve, is charged with the primal sin, as he received the command direct from God, and his sin was without excuse. Here, only the guilt of the transgression is in view; in 2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii 14, the mode, instrument, and process." Bengel assigns three reasons for the omission of Eve: (1.) Adam had received the commandment; (2.) He was not only the head of his race, but also of Eve; (3.) if Adam had not obeyed his wife, one only would have sinned. The omission of the mention of Satan, the primary cause of sin (comp. Gen. iii.; John viii. 44; 2 Cor. xi. 3), he accounts for because (1.) Satan is opposed to God, Adam to Christ, whose economy of grace is here described; (2.) Satan has nothing to do with the grace of Christ. It should be re-

a *weakening* than a strengthening the analogy. We have examples for this use of *ὥσπερ* in Matt. xxv. 14, and of *καθώς*, Gal. iii. 6."—P. S.]

† [This objection was made by De Wette, from whom Tholuck, p. 215, quotes. Meyer calls this explanation illogical, because the universality of Adam's corruption, which is the prominent idea in ver. 12, has no corresponding parallel in the protasis which is supplied from the preceding verse.—P. S.]

* [And also the *efficient* cause in the same sense in which Christ is the efficient cause of righteousness and life. According to the Pelagian and Unitarian theory Adam was merely the *occasion:* he sinned, and set a bad example to others, as Christ set a good example. Here Christ sinks to the position of a mere teacher.—P. S.]

membered, also, as Forbes remarks, that in Genesis the very name of Adam, with the article prefixed (הָאָדָם, the Adam, the man), is treated as an appellative more than as a proper name, and that, in Gen. i. 27, it includes generically both sexes: "So God created Adam (in Hebrew) in his own image, in the image of God created he him: male and female created he them;" comp. Gen. v. 1, 2. It was *man*, or human nature which we have in common with him, that was put on trial in Adam. Paul draws a parallel between Adam and Christ, but never between Eve and Mary. The latter analogy is an unjustifiable inference, first hinted at by Irenæus, and more fully developed by Roman Catholic divines, and became a fruitful source of Mariolatry, which virtually makes the human mother of Christ the fountain of the Christian salvation.—P. S.]

Sin. [ἡ ἁμαρτία. The definite article before ἁμαρτία, and also before θάνατος, denotes sin and death as a power or principle which controls man and reveals itself in hereditary corruption, and in every form of actual sin. So ἡ δικαιοσύνη, which corresponds to it as its opposite, vers. 17, 21, is not a single righteous act, but the power of good as a state and as a working principle. Sin is personified as a fearful tyrant, who acquired universal dominion over the human race; he "reigns in death," ver. 21; "works death in us," vii. 13; "lords it over us," vi. 14; "works all manner of concupiscence," vii. 8; "deceives and slays" the sinner, vii. 11, &c. In all these cases the force of the definite article can be rendered in German, but in English, on the contrary, the *absence* of the article has the force of generalizing, not so much, as far as I know, from any rule of grammar, as from usage, and perhaps for euphony's sake.—P. S.] In what sense? Explanations: 1. Original sin, or natural depravity (Augustine, Calvin); 2. Sinfulness [*Sündhaftigkeit, habitus peccandi*], (Koppe, Olshausen [also Webster and Wilkinson: sinfulness personified; a sinful disposition, our sinful nature; vi. 12, 14]); 3. Actual sin (Limborch, Fritzsche); 4. Sin as a ruling power (Meyer [De Wette], Tholuck), or better as a principle (Rothe). Philippi, on the contrary, understands sin as the unity of propensity and deed, as also Aret., Schmid, J. Müller. But sin, as an individual deed, is expressed by ἐφ' ᾧ, &c. It is therefore the principial or fundamental power (*die principielle Macht*) of sin as the mother of death (James i. 15). [The Apostle very carefully, throughout this whole section, distinguishes between ἁμαρτία, as the generic idea, and παράβασις and παράπτωμα, as a concrete act, the transgression of a law; compare vers. 12, 13, 20, 21, with 15, 16, 17, 18. By the παράπτωμα of Adam the ἁμαρτία entered into the human world, and this ἁμαρτία again became the fruitful mother of the innumerable παραπτώματα of his descendants.—P. S.]

Entered into the world. [εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν; comp. the Book of Wisdom ii. 24 (in explanation of Gen. iii.): φθόνῳ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Sin εἰσῆλθε, *came in*; death διῆλθε, *passed through*; the Mosaic law παρεισῆλθε (ver. 20), *came in by the side*, or *between*.] Limborch: a popular personification. On the excessive personification of sin and death in Fritzsche, see Tholuck, p. 219.—*Into the world.* Not merely into the human world (Meyer), or into human nature (Rothe) but as ruin and destructive power in the whole sphere of humanity in general (see Rom. viii. 20). It is plain that the human sphere of the world alone is assumed here (according to Abelard: *in hanc partem mundi sc. terrenam, in qua homines habitant*), as Tholuck remarks, from the fact that "according to the Apostle's conviction, evil was already in existence in another world." [Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 3; Gen. iii.; Book of Wisdom ii. 24; John viii. 44.—P. S.] The expression indicates not only the tendency to sin and death in human nature (Rothe), but also the propagation of sin (Augustine), because the κόσμος is a conjunction of things, and means an organic connection. The words διῆλθεν and ἐφ' ᾧ refer to the individual and ethical appropriation of sin which is in the κόσμος since Adam's fall.

Death (namely, entered into the world). Explanations: 1. Physical death (Chrysostom, Augustine, Calov., Meyer. Reference to Gen. ii. 17; iii. 19);* 2. Spiritual death (Pelagius); 3. Physical, spiritual, and eternal death; or the collected evil result of sin (Olshausen, De Wette, Tholuck [Philippi, Schmid, Jon. Edwards, Alford, Stuart, Hodge]). This is no doubt correct, for physical death in itself has no biblical and ethical significance (see Rom. viii. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 56; James i. 15).

[The Bible uniformly connects *sin* and *death* as cause and effect; comp. Gen. ii. 17; Ezek. xviii. 4 ("The soul that sinneth, it shall die"); Jer. xxxi. 30; Rom. vi. 16, 21, 24; vii. 10; viii. 13; James i. 15, &c. "*Jeder Sündenfall*," says Dr. Nitzsch, "*ist ein Todesfall, und jeder Fortschritt in der Sünde ein neues Sterben.*" Without sin, there would be neither spiritual nor physical death. This was symbolically intimated by the tree of life in paradise, of which fallen man was forbidden to eat, "lest he live for ever." Adam, if he had not sinned, might have passed to higher forms of life, but without a violent separation of body and soul, without being "unclothed," but by being "clothed upon" (2 Cor. v. 2–4), or, in the beautiful figure of the Rabbins, "by a kiss of the Almighty." *Death* and *life* are very deep and comprehensive terms in the Scriptures, and the connection must decide whether all, or which of the meanings are exclusively or prominently kept in view. There are three kinds of death: (1.) The death of the *soul* (1 John iii. 14; comp. Matt. viii 22; Eph. ii. 1), which is properly the first and immediate effect of sin, since sin is a separation of the soul from God, the fountain of life; (2.) The death of the *body* (Rom. v. 10; Matt. xx. 18; xxvi. 66 John xi. 4, 13; Acts xiii. 28; Phil. i. 20; ii. 8), which is the culmination and end of all physical malady and evil in this world; (3.) the *eternal* death of soul and body (Rom. i. 32; 2 Cor. iii. 16; vii. 10; James v. 20; 1 John v. 16), which is also called the second death, ὁ θάνατος ὁ δεύτερος (in the Apoc. ii. 11; xx. 6, 14; xxi. 8). In our passage (as also Rom. vii. 21, 23; vii. 5; 2 Tim. i. 10), ὁ θάνατος is as comprehensive as ἡ ἁμαρτία, its cause, and as ἡ ζωή, its opposite. It embraces *all physical and moral evil*, as *the penal consequence of sin*; it is death temporal and spiritual, viewed as one united power and principle ruling over the human race. That the Apostle meant physical death is clear from ver. 14, and from his unmistakable ref

* [Gen. ii. 17, where death is mentioned for the first time, speaks rather for a more comprehensive view, see below, sub (3); since the first parents were threatened with the penalty of death to be inflicted on the very day of their fall, and long before their physical death.—P. S.]

erence to Gen. ii. 17; iii. 3, 19; while from vers. 17, 18, 21, we may infer that he had also in mind spiritual and eternal death, as the contrast to eternal life, ζωὴ αἰώνιος, in which the Scripture idea of *life* culminates, as the idea of *death* culminates in eternal damnation. Ewald has an excellent note on this passage (*Die Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus*, p. 378): "Paul knew that, notwithstanding the words Gen. ii. 17, Adam did not literally die immediately after his sin; consequently he must mean by *death* that entire inner corruption (*jenes ganze innere Verderben*) by which even the physical death only becomes true death; just as, on the other hand, he ascribes true life to the genuine Christians even now before the resurrection of the body. All this is so well founded in his constant use of language, that it needs no explanation." Comp. also the remarks of Philippi *in loc.*, and Cremer, *Bibl. Theol. Wörterbuch*, sub θάνατος, p. 282: "*Daher ist* TOD *zusammenfassender Ausdruck für die* GESAMMTE GERICHTLICHE CONSEQUENZ *der Sünde*, Rom. v. 12, 14, 17, 21; vi. 16; James v. 20, *in welchem alles durch die Sünde bedingte Uebel sich concentrirt, synon. Verderben*, ἀπώλεια."—P. S.]

And so (death) passed upon all men. The second θάνατος was left out probably because διῆλθεν would be referred equally to sin and death. But both are comprehended in the θάνατος in its spiritual character. The διέρχεσθαι denotes the extension, the universal progress; though a germ-like development is not contained in the word, but in the thing itself. [οὕτως (*demzufolge, dergestalt, consequently*) connects the universal reign of death, chronologically and logically, with the universal reign of sin, as its preceding cause. Some make καὶ οὕτως, *and thus*, equivalent, by transposition, to οὕτω καί, *so also*, and regard this as the apodosis of the first clause of the twelfth verse; but this is entirely ungrammatical, and inconsistent with the main object of this section, which is to draw a parallel, not between Adam and his posterity, or sin and death, but between Adam and Christ. —εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, *upon all men*, is equivalent to the preceding κόσμος, but differs from it "as the concrete parts from the abstract whole; and διέρχεσθαι differs from εἰσέρχεσθαι as the going from house to house differs from entering a town;" De Wette. Luther well translates διῆλθεν: *ist durchgedrungen, passed through and pervaded*, as a destructive and desolating power.—P. S.]

In such a manner that [*solcherweise dass*, or, **on the ground that**; better: **inasmuch as**]. ἐφ' ᾧ (= ἐφ' οἷς) is as much as ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι. It can therefore mean here: on the ground that; διότι, *propter ea quod* (Meyer); under the supposition that (Baur); on condition that (Rothe); in conformity with it, that. Tholuck [p. 234] favors the meaning *because*, with reference to 2 Cor. v. 4; Phil. iii. 12; yet he makes the *because* relative, and translates, *so far as* they all.

[It is almost unanimously agreed now, that ἐφ' ᾧ, for which the Greeks generally use the plural, ἐφ' οἷς (*propter ea quod*), has here the sense of a conjunction, and that ᾧ is the neuter, not the masculine to be referred back either to εἷς ἄνθρωπος (with Augustine, some Roman Catholics, older Lutherans and Calvinists), or to θάνατος (with Glöckler, Hofmann). It can mean neither *in quo*, ἐν ᾧ (Augustine), nor *per quem*, δι' οὗ (Grotius), nor *propter quem* or *cum quo*, δι' ὅν or σὺν ᾧ (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Œcumenius, Elsner). But it must be resolved either into ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὥστε, *ea conditione ut, ea ratione ut, unter der Voraussetzung, unter der näheren Bestimmtheit dass, on the presupposition, on the definite ground that, on condition that* (so Rothe, in a learned and subtle discussion, l. c. pp. 17–38, and Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.*, ii. 260 f.); or into ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι = διότι (Thomas Magister and Phavorinus: ἐφ' ᾧ, ἀντὶ τοῦ διότι), *propter id quod, auf Grund dessen dass, darum dass weil, on this account that, because*; comp. 2 Cor. v 4; Phil. iii. 12, and classical passages quoted by Meyer, p. 204 f. (so Fritzsche, *Rom. I.* 299 sq., Meyer, Tholuck, Philippi, Winer, *Gramm.*, p. 368, who are followed, without further discussion, by Alford, Webster and Wilkinson, Stuart and Hodge). The latter explanation gives the plain sense, that the universal reign of death is caused by universal sin, while Rothe's explanation conveys the more subtle idea that the actual sin of individuals is a consequence of the same proceeding by which death, through Adam's sin, passed upon all men, or that the sin of Adam has caused the sin of all others in inseparable connection with death. I prefer the translation, *so far as, inasmuch as*, which gives good sense in all the Pauline passages (2 Cor. v. 4: ἐφ' ᾧ οὐ θέλομεν ἐκδύσασθαι, ἀλλ' ἐπενδύσασθαι; Phil. iii. 12: ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ κατελήφθην). It is not so much a causal, as a qualifying and conditioning conjunction (a relative or modified ὅτι), which in our passage shows more clearly the connection of death with sin. It implies that a moral participation of all men in the sin of Adam is the medium or cause of their death; just as faith on our part is the moral condition of our participation in Christ's life. It is unfavorable to the doctrine of a *gratuitous* imputation. The legal act of imputation is not arbitrary and unconditioned, but rests on a moral ground and an objective reality.—P. S.]

[**All sinned** (not, *have* sinned, E. V.), πάντες ἥμαρτον. The aor. II. presents the sinning of all as a historical fact, or a momentary action of the past; comp. ἀπέθανον, in ver. 15; οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον, 2 Cor. v. 14; and especially Rom. iii. 23, where precisely the same phrase occurs: "all sinned," as in one act (in Adam), and consequently became sinners (comp. *Textual Note* [8], p. 128). Some take the aorist in the sense of the perfect ἡμαρτήκασι = ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν εἰσί; but the aorist was chosen with reference to the past event of Adam's fall, which was at the same time virtually the fall of the human race as represented by him, and germinally contained in him.* Ἁμαρτάνειν cannot mean: to be, or, to become sinful (= ἁμαρτωλὸν εἶναι, or, γίγνεσθαι), although this is the necessary *result* of the first sinful act; still less, to suffer the punishment of sin; but it means real, actual sinning. In what sense? The choice in the following list lies between interpretations (4) and (5), which are both equally consistent with the natural grammatical sense of ἥμαρτον; while the other interpretations are more or less strained or false.—P. S.]

Explanations of πάντες ἥμαρτον:

(1.) *In quo*, namely, in Adam, the whole race

* [Winer, p. 259, denies that the aorist is ever confounded with the perfect. Even in Luke i. 1 (ἐπεχείρησαν); John xvii. 4 (ἐδόξασα, ἐτελείωσα); Phil. iii. 12 (ἔλαβον), and similar cases, the action is related simply as passed. The perfect expresses the past action in its relation to the present, so that the *result* of the action is generally, though not necessarily (see Krüger, 151, and Winer, 254), supposed to be continued.—P. S.]

sinned. (Origen,* Chrysostom,† Theophylact, Augustine ‡ [Beza, Brenz, Bucer, Este, Erasmus Schmid], and, as probably "the last among Protestant expositors" [?], Benjamin Carpzov, 1758). § The supposition here is the organic unity of the human race.

(2.) Because all have become sinful [*vitiati sunt, peccatores facti sunt*]—that is, sinners by original sin (Calvin, Melanchthon, Flatt).‖

(3.) Metonymically, because all have been punished as sinners, or are involved in the consequences of the fall (Chrysostom,* Grotius,† Arminians and Socinians [and Calvinists of the Federal school, Macknight, Hodge]).‡

(4.) Some supply even *Adamo peccante* after ἐφ' ᾧ (Pareus, and others; Bengel, Olshausen, &c.). Philippi, p. 179: "We must mentally supply ἐν Ἀδάμ, or more specifically, *Adamo peccante*, to ἥμαρτον." Meyer, likewise, "because all sinned when Adam sinned, in and with him!" 1 Cor xv

* [Origen taught a *personal* fall of all men in a *preexistent* state. In *Ep. ad Rom.* (Opp. iv. p. 546): "*Si Levi in lumbis Abrahæ fuisse perhibetur, multo magis homines in lumbis erant Adæ, cum adhuc esset in paradiso, et omnes homines cum ipso vel in ipso expulsi sunt de paradiso.*"—P. S.]

† [Chrysostom (*Homilia X.*) explains rather loosely and superficially: τι δέ ἐστιν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον; ἐκείνου πεσόντος, καὶ οἱ μὴ φαγόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου γεγόνασιν ἐξ ἐκείνου πάντες θνητοί, *i. e.*, "by the fall of Adam, even those who did not eat of the forbidden tree have all become mortal." This is all he says, and then he passes immediately to ver. 13.—P. S.]

‡ [Augustine, following the wrong translation of the Vulgate—*in quo*—used this passage as an argument for the doctrine of original sin and the fall of the human race in Adam. *De pecc. mer. et rem.* iii. 7: "*In Adamo omnes tunc peccaverunt, quando in ejus natura, illa insita vi qua eos gignere poterat, adhuc omnes ille unus fuerunt.*" *Contra Jul.* v. 12: "*Fuerunt omnes ratione seminis in lumbis Adami quando damnatus est. . . . quemadmodum fuerunt Israelitæ in lumbis Abrahæ, quando decimatus est,*" Heb. vii. 9, 10. *De Civitate Dei*, l. xiii. c. 14: "*Omnes enim fuimus in illo uno, quando omnes fuimus ille unus, qui per feminam lapsus est in peccatum. . . . Nondum erat nobis singillatim creata et distributa forma, in qua singuli viveremus; sed jam natura erat seminalis, ex qua propagaremur;*" *i. e.*, "the form in which we were to live, as individuals, had not yet been created and assigned to us, but that seminal nature was already in existence, from which we were to be propagated." From this last passage it is evident that Augustine did not teach, as he is sometimes misrepresented, a *personal* and *conscious* coexistence and coagency of Adam's posterity in Adam and his fall (which involves the contradiction of an existence before existence), but simply a *potential* or *germinal* coexistence. The *genus homo* or human nature which he represented, was not a receptacle of millions of human beings, but a single, simple essence, which became manifold by propagation. As in the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ we distinguish between nature and person, so also here. Our human nature was on trial in Adam, and fell in him; consequently we all fell as partaking of that nature, and share in his guilt. This seems to me to be Augustine's view. Estius, one of the best Roman Catholic commentators, gives the same interpretation on the basis of the Vulgate translation: "*Dicuntur omnes peccasse in Adam, tanquam in principio et radice totius generis, quoniam in lumbis ejus erant, quando ille peccabat.*" Then, after quoting several passages from Aug., he continues, in explanation of the Augustinian theory: "*Id vero sic intellige: quia tunc quando ille propria voluntate peccavit, in quo tanquam in principio generis, omnes erant, causa data est, per quam deinceps universum genus inficeretur, et singuli constituerentur peccatores, videlicet a suo quisque peccato, quod ex illa origine contraheret; quomodo, si pater attaminatus lepra filios gignat leprosos, dicentur filii facti leprosi a patre, licet unusquisque suam ex illo contrahat lepram.*" This, in a certain sense, is theologically true, but exegetically false—*i. e.*, the doctrine of original sin, or total depravity as derived from Adam, is implied in the whole passage, especially in πάντες ἥμαρτον, but not in ἐφ' ᾧ. For ἐφ' ᾧ is not equivalent to ἐν ᾧ (see above); ἀνθρώπου is too far separated from the relative ᾧ, and the whole phrase, ἁμαρτάνειν ἐπί τινι, meaning, *to sin in some one*, or *by one*, is without example. For a modification of the Augustinian interpretation, see (4) below.—P. S.]

§ [Sam. J. Baird, *Elohim Revealed*, Philad. 1860, p. 417, defends the same view; taking ἐφ' ᾧ = ἐν ᾧ, as in ver. 14; Mark ii. 4; Luke v. 25; ἐν τῷ Ἀδάμ, 1 Cor. xv. 22.—P. S.]

‖ [Melanchthon: "*Omnes habent peccatum, scilicet pravitatem propagatam et reatum.*" Calvin: "*Nempe, inquit, quoniam omnes peccavimus. Porro istud peccare est corruptos esse et vitiosos. Illa enim naturalis pravitas, quam e matris utero afferimus, tametsi non ita cito fructus suos edit, peccatum tamen est coram Domino, et ejus ultionem meretur. Atque hoc est peccatum, quod vocant naturale.*" According to Calvin, then, the inherent, hereditary depravity derived from Adam is the reason why all die. This interpretation is not only ungrammatical, since ἁμαρτάνειν cannot mean, *to become corrupt*, but it also vitiates the analogy between Adam and Christ.—P. S.]

* [Ἐξ ἐκείνου πάντες θνητοί.—P. S.]

† [Grotius: *pœnam luere*, to suffer punishment. He appeals to Gen. xxxi. 36; Job vi. 24; 1 Kings i. 21, for this metonymy of the effect. ἐφ' ᾧ he takes = *through* whom. The same interpretation is more fully defended by Whitby, an Arminian, on Rom. v. 19.—P. S.]

‡ [Meyer calls this interpretation sheer ungrammatical arbitrariness (*nur sprachwidrige Willkür*); for ἥμαρτον means, *they sinned*, and nothing else (p. 204). Nevertheless, it is defended by Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, even in the revised edition of his Comm. (p. 236 ff.), with a degree of dogmatic positiveness, as if there could be no doubt about it. He holds that all men sinned in Adam merely in a *representative* or *putative*, not in any *real* sense, and that ἥμαρτον has the passive meaning: they became legally guilty, and were *regarded* and *treated* as sinners on account of Adam's sin by virtue of a natural and federal relationship between Adam and his posterity. "The only possible way," he says, "in which all men can be said to have sinned in Adam, is putatively." [This is begging the question.] "His act, for some good and proper reason [?], was regarded as their act, just as the act of an agent is regarded as the act of his principal, or the act of a representative as that of his constituents" [although in this case they never elected him]. "The act of the one legally binds the other. It is, in the eye of law and justice, their act." But ἁμαρτάνειν never has this meaning of *putative* sinning. It is obviously impossible in ἁμαρτήσαντας, ver. 14. In the parallel passage, iii. 23, Hodge himself understands it of actual sinning ("*all have sinned, and are sinners*, or, *all sinned*," p. 140). The two solitary passages which he quotes from the Septuagint (Gen. xliii. 9, comp. xliv. 32: ἡμαρτηκὼς ἔσομαι, and 1 Kings i. 21: ἐσόμεθα . . . ἁμαρτωλοί, *i. e.*, in the view of the reigning prince), are neither parallel nor decisive, as has often been shown by older commentators. When Hodge confidently appeals to the authority of "theologians of every grade and class of doctrine, Calvinists, Arminians, Lutherans, and Rationalists," in favor of his interpretation (p. 241), he is greatly mistaken. I know of no recent commentator of note, German or English, who agrees with him on this point. Philippi and Wordsworth, whom he quotes on his side, hold the realistic Augustinian view (which Hodge repudiates as nonsense. See next foot-note.) So does even Robert Haldane, the most rigorous Scotch Calvinistic commentator on the Romans, who says (p. 211 of the Amer. edition): "Adam's sin was as truly the sin of every one of his posterity, as if it had been personally committed by him. It is only in this way that all could be involved in its consequence. Besides, it is only in this light that it is illustrative of justification by Christ. Believers truly die with Christ, and pay the debt in Him by their union or oneness with Him. It belongs not to us to inquire how these things can be. We receive them on the testimony of God." . . . "If God deals with men as sinners on account of Adam's sin, then it is self-evident that they are sinners on that account. The just God could not deal with men as sinners on any account which did not make them truly sinners." The metonymical interpretation arose from opposition to the doctrine of original sin. Hodge tries to defend the dogma of imputation on a Socinian exegesis. But by rejecting the realistic theory of a participation of Adam's posterity in his fall, he loses the basis for a just imputation, and resolves it into a legal fiction. Only a sinful and guilty being can be the subject of the displeasure of a righteous and holy God. We do not object to the doctrine of imputation in itself, but simply to that form of it which ignores or denies the *vital* nature of our connection with Adam and with Christ, as plainly taught in this whole section. Adam is our natural representative *de facto* as well as *de jure*. He is the root of humanity, and his fall affected the stock, and every branch, by the inherent law of organic life-union. "Not Adam's transgression outwardly reckoned, but Adam's sinfulness and mortality inwardly communicated or imparted," are the chief points of comparison, and placed in contrast with the righteousness and life of Christ, with whom we hold even a more intimate life-union by faith, than with Adam by sin.—P. S.]

22 [ἐν τῷ ᾿Αδάμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν] has been alleged as proof of this.*

(5.) The expression must be understood of the personal sins of individuals (Reiche, Rückert, De Wette, Tholuck [Fritzsche, Baur, Van Hengel, Stuart], and others).* Meyer calls this interpretation false in view of the many millions of children who have not yet sinned † [*i. e.*, committed *actual* transgression]. Tholuck refers to the *disposition* of children to sin [which, however, is inconsistent with ἥμαρτον.—P. S.]. But he who finds no difficulty in conceiving that children sinned *in Adam*, should find less difficulty in thinking that they sinned in the womb of their mother, and least difficulty in sinking their individuality in the solidarity of their sinful ancestry. Meyer objects further, that the view that the death of individuals is the result of their personal sins, would vitiate and even contradict the whole parallel between Adam and Christ. "For as the *sin of Adam* brought death to all (therefore not their self-committed sin), so the obedience of Christ (not their own virtue) brought life to all (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 22)." ‡ Thus an absolute natural necessity prevailed on both sides! The proper consideration of the parallel, on the contrary, leads to this conclusion: As in the actual appropriation of the merits of Christ a personal ethical appropriation

* [This interpretation, which Dr. Lange treats rather too severely, agrees theologically with Augustine's (No. 1), although it differs from it grammatically. It is defended by two of the ablest modern commentators, Philippi, and (in recent editions) by Meyer. Philippi, whom Dr. Hodge (p. 241) wrongly quotes in favor of his purely legal imputation theory (see the preceding note), says, after criticising other views: "*Wir werden deshalb mit Nothwendigkeit zu derjenigen Auffassung zurückgeführt, welche, obgleich sie von den neueren Auslegern aufgegeben ist (vgl. jedoch Olshausen) und fernliegend erscheint, dennoch die nächste, einfachste und natürlichste ist. Es ist nämlich zu* ἥμαρτον *im Gedanken:* ἐν ᾿Αδάμ, *oder noch präciser: 'Adamo peccante' zu ergänzen. 'Non agitur de peccato singulorum proprio,' sagt Bengel. 'Omnes peccarunt, Adamo peccante,' oder, wie Koppe es ausdrückt, 'ipso actu quo peccavit Adamus.' Dafür spricht auch der momentane Sinn des Aoristes* ἥμαρτον. *Der Tod ist zu Allen hindurchgedrungen, weil sie Alle sündigten, als Adam sündigte, weil in der Sünde Adam's ihre eigene Sünde mitbeschlossen war. So würden wir also dem wesentlichen Sinne nach, wenn auch auf anderem grammatischem Wege,* DAS AUGUSTINISCHE 'IN QUO OMNES PECCAVERUNT,' *wieder gewinnen. Passend lässt sich 2 Cor. v. 15 vergleichen:* εἰ εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον, *wozu wir hier den entsprechenden Gegensatz:* εἰ εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἥμαρτεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἥμαρτον *finden. Wie ferner hier von dem* ἁμαρτάνειν, *so ist 1 Kor.* xv. 22 *von dem* ἀποθνήσκειν *Aller* ἐν τῷ ᾿Αδάμ *die Rede. Der Apostel stellt demnach die Menscheitssünde als objectiv in Adam beschlossen dar, gerade so wie er die Menschheitsgerechtigkeit als objectiv in Christo beschlossen denkt, und die Parallele erhält nun erst die rechte Präcision und plastische Anschaulichkeit.*" Meyer, who is misrepresented by Dr. Hodge (p. 233) as charging Paul with forgetfulness in stating what is not true in point of fact, holds the same Augustinian view, and stated it plainly not only in the fourth edition (1865, p. 201), but in the third (1859, p. 187), and even in the second edition (1854, ten years before the appearance of Hodge's revision!) as follows: "(ἐφ᾽ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον) AUF GRUND DESSEN DASS, *d. h.*, WEIL ALLE SÜNDIGTEN, *nämlich (beachte den momentanen Sinn des Aor.) als durch den Einen die Sünde in die Welt eintrat. Weil, als* ADAM *sündigte,* ALLE *Menschen in und mit ihm, dem Vertreter der ganzen Menschheit (nicht: '*EXEMPLO *Adami,'* PELAG.), *gesündigt haben, ist der Tod, welcher durch die in die Welt gekommene Sünde in die Welt kam, vermöge dieses ursächlichen Zusammenhanges der durch Adam in's Vorhandensein getretenen Sünde und des Todes auf* ALLE *verbreitet worden.* ALLE *wurden durch Adam's Fall sterblich, weil dieses Gesündigthaben Adam's ein Gesündigthaben* ALLER *war, mithin* τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον, ver. 15. *So ist es allerdings in Adam begründet, dass Alle sterben* (ἐν τῷ ᾿Αδάμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν, 1 *Kor.* xv. 22), *weil nämlich, als Adam sündigte, Alle sündigten, Alle als* ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν (ver. 19), *und somit der durch seine Sünde eingekommene Tod keinen verschonen kann.*" The same interpretation is substantially adopted by the best English commentators of the age. Alford says: "All sinned in the *seed*, as planted in the nature by the sin of our forefather, and in the *fruit*, as developed by each conscious responsible individual in his own practice. . . . Observe how entirely this assertion of the Apostle contradicts the Pelagian or individualistic view of men, that each is a separate creation from God, existing solely on his own exclusive responsibility, and affirms the Augustinian or realistic view, that all are evolved by God's appointment from an original stock, and, though individually responsible, are generically involved in the corruption and condemnation of their original." Wordsworth: "Observe the aorist tense, ἥμαρτον, *they all sinned*; that is, at a *particular time*. And when was that? Doubtless, at the Fall. *All men sinned* in Adam's sin. All fell in his fall. *All men were that one man*, Adam (Augustine). All men were in him, as a river is in its source, and as a tree is in its root. We are all by *nature* in the first Adam, as we are all by *grace* in the second Adam, Christ." Webster and Wilkinson: "All sinned virtually when Adam sinned, because in him their nature became sinful."

This good orthodox interpretation, supported by the most respectable array of authorities from Augustine and the Reformers down to Philippi and Meyer, Dr. Hodge calls mystic and pantheistic nonsense, which "does not rise even to the dignity of a contradiction, and has no meaning at all;" adding: "It is a monstrous evil to make the Bible contradict the common sense and common consciousness of men" (p. 236). We hold that all men sinned in Adam, not indeed personally by conscious actual transgression (which Augustine never said or meant; see the passages quoted in the third foot-note on p. 178), but virtually or potentially; in other words, that Adam fell, not as an individual simply, but as the real representative head of the human race, and that his fall vitiated human nature itself, and prospectively his whole posterity, in the same manner in which the disease of the germ and root will affect the tree and branches proceeding from it. This may be *uncommon* sense (as is the whole fifth chapter of Romans), but it is certainly no *non*sense. The human race is not a sandheap, but an organic unity; and only on the ground of such a vital unity, as distinct from a mechanical or merely federal unity, can we understand and defend the doctrine of original sin, the imputation of Adam's sin, and of Christ's righteousness. Without an actual communion of life, imputation is an arbitrary legal arrangement. We readily admit that the Augustinian view is liable to objections (see Lange's and our strictures in *Doctrinal and Ethical*, No. 2 and 3), but it is far preferable to the legal fiction theory.—P. S.]

* [So Theodoret: *οὐ γὰρ τὴν τοῦ προπάτορος ἁμαρτίαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν οἰκείαν ἕκαστος δέχεται τοῦ θανάτου τὸν ὅρον.* Pelagius may be ranked here, for in his brief comments on Romans he explains ἐφ᾽ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον: "*In eo quod omnes peccaverunt, exemplo Adæ peccant*," or "*per imitationem*," in opposition to "*per propagationem*." Julian of Eclanum, the ablest champion of Pelagianism, takes ἐφ᾽ ᾧ in the sense of *propter quod* (*Aug. Contra Jul.* vi. 75; Op. imperf. ii. 66). But both denied original sin, which may be held in perfect consistency with this interpretation of ἥμαρτον. Among American commentators it is advocated especially by Barnes and Stuart. We quote from Moses Stuart: "There remains, therefore, only the first plain and simple method of interpretation, viz., all men have sinned in their own persons; all men have themselves incurred the guilt of sin, and so subjected themselves to its penalty; or at least, all men are themselves sinners, and so are liable to death." Prof. Dwight, in his article against Hodge, seems to adopt this view; taking, however ἥμαρτον in a semi-figurative sense, "so that Paul conceives of our individual, personal sinning, as summed up and centred in Adam, not because we sinned either really or putatively when he did, but because, when he sinned, the whole future results were then made certain, and so, in a sense, were accomplished" (l. c. p. 560).—P. S.]

† [The German original reads: "*Dagegen sagt Meyer, das Wort passe nicht auf die gesündigt habenden Kinder*," *children who have sinned*, instead of "*in Betreff der vielen Millionen* NOCH NICHT *gesündigt habenden K.*" (see Meyer, p. 203). The printer's omission of *noch nicht*, *not yet*, makes sad work here with the argument, and caused some perplexity to the translator. Flatt, and others, raised the same objection to the above interpretation, viz., that it would include infants among *actual* sinners, which is not true. Hodge, p. 232 f., urges five arguments against it.—P. S.]

‡ [So also Hodge: "It would make the Apostle teach that, as all men die because they personally sin, so all men live because they are personally and inherently righteous. This is contrary not only to this whole passage, but to all Paul's teaching, and to the whole gospel."—P. S.]

takes place by faith, so in the actual sharing in the guilt of Adam does an ethical participation by unbelief take place (see Rom. xi. 32). It is a great error to imagine that, in order to avoid the Pelagian heresy, we must cast ourselves into the arms of the Augustinian theory, and do violence to the plain text. This is done by Beza, Calvin, Philippi, and Meyer, though by each in a different way.

(6.) The ἐφ' ᾧ is understood as *causa finalis:* UNTO *which*, viz., death or punishment; thus making ἐπί to mark the end, or consequence, to which sinning came. (Venema, Schmid, Glöckler, and Ewald [formerly, not now].)* Meyer observes, that this telic view implies a necessary, though not intended effect, in accordance with the idea of fate.

(7.) Hofmann: Under whose (death's) dominion they sinned. This view might be better supported by the thought in Heb. ii. 15, than by the language in Heb. ix. 15. Yet it is untenable.†

(8.) Thomasius: Under which relation (namely, that sin and death came into the world by one man) all sinned, &c.

It is evident that the most of these explanations are attempts, from doctrinal considerations, to avoid the idea of individual personal guilt, and by this means a relation, clear enough in itself, is obscured. The Apostle's assumption is the priority of sin in relation to death, and the causal connection of the two. Accordingly, the meaning is, since sin came into the world as an abnormal ethical principle, death came into the world with it as the corresponding abnormal physiological principle. Therefore the propagation of the abnormal principle of death presupposes the preceding propagation of the principle of sin in the real sinning of all. It arises from the unity and solidarity of humanity, that certain cases —for example, children born dead, or dying [and idiots]—do not here come into consideration. The definition of the ἐφ' ᾧ, *under the presupposition that*, is therefore the most natural. In view of the death of innocent children, we may assume different degrees of guilt and death: "in proportion as," or "in what measure, they all sinned."

Ver. 13. **For until the law, &c.** [Ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου,—*i. e.*, from Adam to the Mosaic legislation, comp. ver. 14—ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ. Alford: "How, consistently with chap. iv. 15, could all men sin, *before the law?* This is now explained." But iv. 15 is too far off, and treats of παράβασις, not of ἁμαρτία. γάρ connects this verse with πάντες ἥμαρτον, ver. 12.—P. S.] The Apostle did not need to show first that the death of all was grounded in Adam's sin (Meyer); this he could presuppose from Jewish and Christian knowledge. But he proves rather that the actual extension of death took place always under the supposition of preceding sin in the world. Therefore his first proposition: Even in the period between Adam and Moses, sin was universal in the world. It was indeed not imputed, not placed directly in the light of the conscious judgment of God, because the law, as the rule of conduct and the accuser, was not yet present. But, indirectly, its presence was made manifest by its effect, the despotic government of death; although a transgression in such a definite way as that committed by Adam could not occur in the period designated (notwithstanding many analogies: Cain, the Cainites, Ham, Ishmael, Esau). Even the transgression again made manifest by the Mosaic law does not remove the great antagonism by which, in principle, sin and death proceeded from Adam, the type of Christ, the antitype, from whom, in principle, righteousness and life proceeded. Meyer supposes the Apostle to say: "The death of individuals, which passed also upon those who have not sinned, as Adam did, against a positive commandment, cannot be derived from sin committed before the law, because, the law not being present, the imputation was wanting [absolutely?]; and the conclusion which Paul draws therefrom, is, that it is by Adam's sin (not by individual sins) that death has been produced" (!). Now, how does this agree with the history of the Deluge, and of Sodom and Gomorrah? Here, definite death is everywhere traced to definite offences. Tholuck's view of the connection [p. 238 ff.] is similar to Meyer's. The most of the later commentators, on the contrary, properly regard vers. 13 and 14 as an argument for πάντες ἥμαρτον (Rückert, De Wette, Neander, and others; and formerly Diodorus, Calvin, and others). Calov. has correctly concluded: Since they were punished because of sin, they must have had some law.*

But sin is not imputed [reckoned, *in Rechnung gebracht*, Ἁμαρτία οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται]. (Philem. ver. 18 [*text. rec.*] is the only other place).† Meyer explains: Is brought to account by God for punishment [*wird in Rechnung gebracht*, viz., *zur Bestrafung*]. His citation (chap. iv. 15) is sufficient to correct him. It is with the νόμος, and the consciousness of it, that the ἁμαρτία (which is also transgression, according to the measure of the natural conscience) first receives the impressed character of conscious transgression, παράβασις, and therewith the ὀργή is first finished by the κατεργάζεσθαι of the νόμος. Therefore even the sin of the generations before the flood was not yet definitely settled by its overthrow (1 Peter iii. 20; iv. 6); therefore the people of Sodom and Gomorrah were guilty of less sin than the contemporaries of Jesus. The ἐλλογεῖν of sin constitutes therefore the reverse side of the λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην; it does not denote any preliminary attribution, but the final imputation, or settlement.—Explanations: *Is not imputed*, *a.* By God; (1.) Not in general (the Deluge

* [In his *Jahrbücher der bibl. Wissenschaft*, ii. p. 171, Ewald explained, with the rejection of the second ὁ θάνατος: "*und so zu allen Menschen durchdrang* DAS, WORAUFHIN ALLE SÜNDIGTEN," "and so passed upon all men *that unto which* all sinned," viz., death, which in Gen. ii. 17 is decreed as the punishment of sin, so that whosoever sins, sins unto death—*i. e.*, must die. But subsequently, in his Comm. on the Pauline Epistles (1857, p. 327), Ewald translated: "SOFERN *alle sündigten*," "*inasmuch* as all sinned," and remarks (in a foot-note on p. 373) that this meaning of ἐφ' ᾧ (as a conjunction) is similar to the preceding οὕτως, showing death to be the consequence of sin.—P. S.]

† [Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, vol. i. p. 529, 2d ed., takes ἐπί as a preposition of time, and refers τῷ to the preceding θάνατος (which is wanting in several MSS.) in the sense: *bei dessen Vorhandensein*, i. e., *during the reign of death* all sinned. He quotes, in support, Heb. ix. 15: αἱ ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεις. But this simple and almost trivial idea could have been expressed much more clearly. The interpretation of Thomasius (sub 8) resembles that of Hofmann, except that he takes ᾧ as neuter: *beim Vorhandensein welches Verhältnisses*. But the preceding words pronounce a fact, not an abstract relation. Comp. Meyer, p 206.—P. S.]

* [Hodge makes the whole doctrine and argument of the Apostle to be, "that there are penal evils which come upon men antecedent to any transgressions of their own; and as the infliction of those evils implies a violation of law, it follows that they are regarded and treated as sinners *on the ground of the disobedience of another*" (p. 252).—P. S.]

† [Outside of these two passages in the New Testament, the word, according to Meyer, occurs but once, viz., in Boeckh, *Inscript.* i. p. 850, A. 35. It means ἐν λόγῳ τιθέναι λογίζεσθαι, *to reckon in, to put to one's account*.—P. S.]

Sodom and Gomorrah, &c., were exceptions); (2.) Not in the usual manner of sin (Bengel: *peccatum non notat scelera insignia* [*qualia Sodomitæ ante Mosis tempora luerunt, sed malum commune*]); (3.) The Arminians: the θάνατος was only natural evil; (4.) Calov., better than all: the word must be understood only hypothetically. The men of the ante-Mosaic period also had a kind of law. *b.* By man (Ambrose, Augustine, Theodore Mopsvestia, Luther: "Sin is not minded," *man achtet ihrer nicht*). ∵ Zwingli: By the human judge. Altogether foreign to the context. Hofmann: the proposition laid down refers only to humanity in general, and not to individuals. This is a modification of Schleiermacher's representation of penal justice.—We must add the remark, that the imputing judge is God, but that, in the imputation, the human knowledge of the παράβασις in the light of the judgment is to be taken fully into consideration. [Alford explains ἐλλ., "**reckoned**, '*set down as transgression*'—'put in formal account,' *by God*. In the case of those who had not the written law, ἁμαρτία is not formally reckoned as παράβασις, set over against the command; but, in a certain sense, as distinctly proved, chap. ii. 9–16, it *is reckoned*, and they are condemned for it."—P. S.]

When there is no law [μὴ ὄντος νόμου]. Not: *Where the law is not.* [So Alford, and those who refer νόμος to the *Mosaic* law exclusively.—P. S.] The Apostle appears to lay down the proposition in the form of a general maxim ("where there is no accuser, there is no judge") in order to suggest the idea of degrees of legality and imputation (see the explanation of Calov.). Here, too, Meyer would relieve the death of the generations before Moses from being caused by individual sin (see, on the contrary, Ps. xc.). We say, with chap. i. 18 ff., that the falling of those generations into sin was, in general, a great judgment of God; but an ethical *because* [i. 19] always precedes.

Ver. 14. **Nevertheless** [notwithstanding the relative non-imputation of sin] **death reigned** [Ἀλλὰ ἐβασίλευσεν, emphatically put first, ὁ θάνατος]. *Death*, already personified, appears here as a ruler, and, according to its nature, as a tyrant.* The universal reign of death implies the universal reign of sin as its cause, in proof of ver. 12 (against Meyer and Hofmann). The dominion of death embraces not only physical death with all its historical terrors, but also the consciousness of death, or the sting of death (1 Cor. xv. 56), and the consequence of death, the dreary, wretched existence in Sheol.† [μέχρι (*until*) Μωϋσ. = ἄχρι νόμου, ver. 13. There is no clear difference between μέχρι and ἄχρι, except that μέχρι, from μακρός, etymologically, denotes primarily extension, or length of time; ἄχρι, from ἄκρος, point of time.—P. S.]

Even over those, &c. [καὶ ἐπὶ‡ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ]. Over those who, unlike Adam, were not guilty of a definite παράβασις, or transgression of a definite command of God. The καί may be understood as antithetical to Adam, or better, as making a distinction between sinners in the general sense, and the wicked transgressors of special laws of God, who effect, as it were, new falls of man, such as Cain, Ham, &c. Athanasius explains thus: those who committed no mortal sin. Grotius: no gross sins; Crell, and others: transgressed no law to which the threat of death was attached. But the measure is simply the παράβασις, as in chap. iv. 15. The elder expositors have included here also the children [and idiots] subjected "by Adam's sin to the *pœna damni*;" Brenz makes this the exclusive reference [against which Calvin correctly protests. Children are included, but not specially intended.—P. S.] Indirectly, this verse refers definitely to the connection between sin and death in the period from Adam to Moses, as has been also perceived by De Wette, Fritzsche, and Baur, but is opposed in vain by Meyer.

Who is a type of the coming one [*i. e.*, the second Adam, ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος]. Koppe comes in positive conflict with the context, when he takes μέλλοντος as neuter: of that which should come. The first Adam is the type of the second (1 Cor. xv. 45), and is the principle of the first eon, as Christ is the principle of the second, but according to the antagonism between the first and second eons. See Meyer, for similar expressions of the Rabbis; *e. g.*, *Adamus postremus est Messias*. According to Tholuck, the deduction of the antithetical side should now have followed, but Paul was contented with the ὅς ἐστι, &c., in order to indicate the other half. But in our view the antithesis has already preceded (vers. 9–11), and is fully elaborated in chap. vi.–viii., after the transitional individual antitheses that now follow.

[This important clause points back to ver. 12, and indicates the apodosis, the other member of the comparison. Τύπος, from τύπτω, *to strike, to wound*, has a variety of significations which are closely related, and yet may seem in some cases contradictory (comp. the German *Abbild*, *Urbild*, *Vorbild*). It means (1.) a blow; (2.) a print, or impression, made by a blow (John xx. 25, τὸν τύπον τῶν ἥλων); (3.) a form, image, figure (*Bild*, *Abbild;* so often in the classics, and in Acts vii. 43, τοὺς τύπους, οὓς ἐποιήσατε προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς); (4.) a pattern, model (*Muster*, *Modell*, *Urbild;* Rom. vi. 17, τύπον διδαχῆς; Acts vii. 44; Heb. viii. 5; in the two last passages, however, τύπος is taken by some in the sense of *copy;* comp. Bleek on Heb. viii. 5, vol. iii. p. 439 f.); (5.) a moral model or example for imitation (*Vorbild;* 2 Thess. iii. 9, ἵνα ἑαυτοὺς τύπον δῶμεν ὑμῖν εἰς τὸ μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς; 1 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. ii. 7; Phil. iii. 17; 1 Pet. v. 3); (6.) a historical prefiguration (*Vorbild*), or type in the usual theological sense—*i. e.*, a person or thing designed to foreshadow or symbolize a future person or thing which is the ἀντίτυπος (*Urbild*); so 1 Cor. x. 6, 11, and here. Generally the New Testament antitype is related to the Old Testament type, as the substance is to the shadow, or the

* [Origen: "*Videtur Ap. mortem describere veluti tyranni alicujus ingressum.*"—P. S.]

† [Bengel: "*Morti adscribitur* REGNUM, *ut* ROBUR, Heb. ii. 14. *Sane vix ullus rex tot subditos habet, quot vel reges mors abstulit. Immane regnum. Non est Hebraismus. Imperat peccatum: imperat justitia.*"—P. S.]

‡ [Βασιλεύειν with ἐπί is a Hebraism (מָלַךְ עַל); comp. Luke i. 33; xix. 14; 1 Sam. viii. 9, 11; in classic Greek it rules the genitive or dative. The preposition signifies the persons over whom the sovereignty is exercised. The second ἐπί before τῷ ὁμοιώματι expresses the model to which the act is conformed; comp. ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, Luke i. 15. The whole phrase corresponds to the Hebrew כִּדְמוּת, and is equivalent to ὁμοίως τῇ παραβάσει. It must not be connected with ἐβασίλευσεν (Chrysostom and Bengel), but as is usually done, with μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας.—P. S.]

original to the copy.* But Christ corresponds to Adam in the antithetical sense: Adam being the author of death for all, Christ the author of life for all. The prefigurative feature in Adam was his central and universal significance for the whole race, which was fulfilled in a much higher sense and with opposite effect in Christ, the absolute and perfect Man. In 1 Cor. xv. 45, Paul likewise contrasts ὁ πρῶτος Ἀδάμ and ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ, with reference, no doubt, to the Rabbinical theology, in which the Messiah is called הָאָדָם הָאַחֲרוֹן, *Adamus postremus*, in opposition to הָאָדָם הָרִאשׁוֹן.† To this personal contrast corresponds the contrast of two epochs and orders of things, ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος and ὁ αἰὼν μέλλων. *The coming one* (τοῦ μέλλοντος) is not to be referred to the second coming of Christ (Fritzsche, De Wette), but to the first. Paul speaks from the historical standpoint of the first Adam.—P. S.]

SECOND PARAGRAPH (VERS. 15–19).

Tholuck remarks on the train of thought to ver. 19: In the explanations of the elder expositors there is no attempt to trace the connection and progress of thought to ver. 19; many of the later ones doubt altogether the possibility of such a proof. Morus says: "*De hac dissimilitudine agitur jam per quinque versus ita, ut quinquies idem illud repetatur, variatis quidem verbis, at re manente semper eadem.*" Köllner and Rückert similarly; against whom, see Rothe. According to Tholuck, the train of thought is as follows: In ver. 15, the *quantitative* "more" on the side of the operation proceeding from Christ; in vers. 16, 17, the *qualitative* "more;" in vers. 18, 19, resumption of the parallel, including the differences pointed out. Our construction is given above.

[Vers. 15–17 occupy an intermediate position between ver. 12 and vers. 18 and 19; and as vers. 13 and 14 are explanatory of the reign of death in connection with sin, asserted in ver. 12, so vers. 15–17 are qualifying, by stating as briefly and tersely as possible the disparity in the parallel between Adam and Christ, in favor of the superabounding grace of Christ. The admirable symmetrical adjustment of parts will appear from the following arrangement of the text in literal translation:

15. But not as the fall (παράπτωμα)
so also (is) the grace (χάρισμα):

for if by the fall
of the one man (τοῦ ἑνός)
the many died;
much more
did the grace of God and the gift by the grace
of the one man Jesus Christ
abound unto the many.

16. And not as by one guilty transgression (ἁμαρτήσαντος)*
(so also is) the gift (τὸ δώρημα):

for the judgment (issued in, or, came)
from one (fall)
unto condemnation (κατάκριμα).
but the grace (issued in, came)
from many falls
unto a righteous act (δικαίωμα)

17. For if by the fall of the one †
Death reigned
through the one;
much more
will they who receive the abundance
of the grace and the gift of righteousness
reign in life
through the one Jesus Christ.—P. S.]

A. *The contrast in the effects of the principles made manifest.* 1. The natural consequences in relation to persons (ver. 15); 2. The positive consequences in relation to the intensity, the essential gradation of the effects (ver. 16). Ver. 15 refers to the opposition of Christian salvation to the ruin in the non-legal period and sphere; ver. 16, to its opposition to the ruin in the legal world.

Ver. 15. **But not as the fall (transgression), so also is the gift of grace** ‡ [Ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, οὕτως καὶ τὸ χάρισμα]. We hold that the Apostle, in his brief and pregnant expressions in vers. 15 and 16, lays down axioms in negative construction. Meyer translates ver. 15: "Not as the trespass, so also the gift of grace;" and quite unintelligibly ver. 16: "And not as by one who sinned is the gift." The παράπτωμα is ἑνός, the χάρισμα ἑνός. As principles which enter humanity and permeate it, Adam and Christ are alike; but in the nature of their effects they constitute contrasts.—Rosenmüller, and others, would neutralize the negation by regarding οὐχ as interrogative; but this, as Meyer remarks, is forbidden by the contrasting character of the contents. We see no reason for taking the παράπτωμα, contrary to its most natural signification, as "offence;" it denotes, with sin, a fall, an ethical defeat; yea, the fall as a medium of the fall, just as the χάρισμα of Christ is not merely χάρις, but a medium of the χάρις. [Παράπτωμα, from παραπίπτω, *to fall*, is not a sinful state or condition, but a concrete actual sin, the transgression of the law (παράβασις), the act of disobedience (παρακοή) by which Adam fell; comp. vers. 16, 18, 19, and Book of Wisdom x. 1, where it is likewise used of the fall. τὸ χάρισμα and ἡ χάρις mean nearly the same as ἡ δωρεά in this verse, τὸ δώρημα, ver. 16, δικαίωσις ζωῆς, ver. 18, but they emphasize the idea that salvation is of free grace. Forbes ingeniously refers τὸ χάρισμα, the *Grace* which pardons the sinner, antithetically to Death, the penalty of transgression, and τὸ δώρημα, the *Gift* of righteousness, antithetically to Sin, which it removes and supersedes; the one is mainly the grace that *justifies*, the other the grace that *sanctifies*. See his note, p. 243 f.—P. S.] Tholuck thinks that we should expect δικαίωμα [ὑπακοή would correspond better.—P. S.]

* [Ἀντίτυπος, ἀντίτυπον (literally, *counterblow*), is, however, sometimes equivalent to τύπος in the sense of *copy* (*Abbild*), as Heb. ix. 24, ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν; 1 Pet. iii. 21; and *Apost. Const.* iv. 14, where the sacramental bread and wine are called the *antitypes* of the body and blood of Christ. Comp. Bleek on the Hebrews, vol. iii. p. 591.—P. S.]

† [Tholuck, p. 246, quotes a remarkable passage from the book, *Neve Shalom R. Abraham Ben Isaac* (died 1593), which shows perhaps the reflex influence of Paul upon the Rabbinical theology: "The last Adam is the Messiah; He will be higher than Moses, higher than the angels who serve Him, and the old sin by which death has been introduced will be abolished by Him, for in His days the dead will rise. This was the Divine intention at the creation of man, that he should be eternal; but sin occasioned death: *now the Divine intention is fulfilled by the second Adam, who is the antitype of the first.*"—P. S.]

* [Or, "by the one that sinned," if we read ἁμαρτήσαντος. See *Textual Note* [6], and *Exeg. Note* below.—P. S.]

† [τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι, the reading of Cod. Sin. Lachmann, Alford, and the *text. rec.* Lange prefers, with Meyer, the reading: ἐν ἑνὶ παραπτώματι, "by one fall." See *Textual Note* [7], and *Exeg. Notes* below.—P. S.]

‡ [According to Lange's translation: *Aber nicht steht's* (*im Sinn der Gleichmaessigkeit Adams und Christi*) *wie mit dem Sündenfall also mit dem Gnadengut* (*der persoenlichen Gnadengabe Christus*). Alford translates: *But not* (in all points) *as the act of transgression, so also is the gift of grace.*—P. S.]

instead of *χάρισμα*. But the question here is concerning the natural or historical effects of both principles, while in ver. 16 they are presented in their relation to law and right.

For if through the fall of the one the many died [Εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ (mark the definite article, which is overlooked in the E. V.) ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ (*the* many, *i. e.*, the immense multitude of all the descendants of the *one* Adam) ἀπέθανον.—P. S.]. The *εἰ* is not hypothetical. There is an oxymoron in the expression: *one fell*, *many died* (not only the one). Why *οἱ πολλοί*, and not *πάντες*, as in vers. 12 and 18? Meyer: "The antithesis to the *εἷς* is made more sensible and stronger by marking the totality as multitude; for '*possunt aliqua esse omnia, quæ non sunt multa*,' Augustine. Grotius wrongly: '*fere omnes, excepto Enocho*,' which is contradicted by vers. 12 and 18." [*ἀπέθανον* must be taken in the same comprehensive sense as *θάνατος* in ver. 12; see p. 176. It is parallel to *ἥμαρτον*, ver. 12, and must be explained accordingly; see p. 177.—P. S.]

Much more. Is *πολλῷ μᾶλλον* the expression of a logical *plus*, that is, of an inference ([Chrysostom, *πολλῷ γὰρ τοῦτο εὐλογώτερον*] Theodoret, Philippi [Fritzsche, Hodge, Stuart], and others), or of a real *plus*, a comparison (Calvin [Bengel*], Rothe [Alford: much more abundant], &c.). [In other words, does *πολλῷ μᾶλλον* express a stronger degree of *evidence*, as an *argumentum a minore ad majus* (here *a pejori ad melius*), as it certainly does vers. 9 and 10, or a higher degree of *efficacy?*—P. S.] Meyer: This latter is contrary to ver. 17. This is so far right as death, viewed absolutely, is an absolute negation, and a real *plus* [a higher degree of abundance] is comprised already in *περισσεύειν*. But the logical *plus* involves also a real *plus*. [So also Tholuck.] It rests on the following antitheses: 1. The *εἷς* introduced here without name, and opposite to him, *ὁ θεός* and *ὁ εἷς ἄνθρωπος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*; 2. *παράπτωμα*, and the opposite *ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι*; 3. *ἐπερίσσευσεν*, in opposition to the simple fact, *ἀπέθανον*. The *χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ* is the source and spirit of the universal and personal charisma, which is Christ himself; the *δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι*, &c., is its form and appearance, the positive gift of Divine adoption, with the Divine inheritance, in the pardon of sin. Both must not be resolved into an *ἓν διὰ δυοῖν* (Rosenmüller, and others). According to Rothe, Tholuck, and others, *ἐν χάριτι* must be connected with *δωρεά*; according to De Wette and Meyer, *δωρεά* stands absolutely, and *ἐν χάριτι*, &c., belongs to *ἐπερίσσευσεν*, on account of the antithesis to *παραπτώματι*. But in that case the article should be expected before *χάριτι*. Besides, *δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι* forms the idea of *δώρημα*. The aorist indicates an event which had already taken place.

Ver. 16. **And not as by one transgression** [Καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήματος, which Lange renders *Verschuldung*, transgression accompanied with guilt.—P. S.]. We must first of all substitute the reading *ἁμαρτήματος* of the Codd. D. E. F. G., and of the Itala [Vulg.: *Et non sicut per unum peccatum*] for *ἁμαρτήσαντος* [*by one that transgressed*], although the latter has better authority.* The reason lies in the text; ver. 16 contains only definitions of things, not persons. The opposite of *ἁμάρτημα* is *παραπτώματα*; besides, we have *δώρημα*, *κρῖμα*, *κατάκριμα*, *χάρισμα*, and *δικαίωμα*. Tholuck observes: "Those Codd. present frequently a corrupted text, one conformed to the Latin translation; and as *ἁμαρτήματος* is not even sufficiently attested by external authorities, it must give way to the more difficult reading." But, at first appearance, *δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος* was the easier reading, for it was supposed that in every antithesis Adam himself must have been mentioned again. Meyer explains: "*And not by one that sinned* (*ἁμαρτήσαντος*) *so is the gift*, that is, it is not so as if it would be caused *δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος*." † Tholuck: "The gift has another character than that which came by the one who sinned." These explanations are no recommendation to the reading *ἁμαρτήσαντος*. For, first, the thought that the *δώρημα* may have come by one that sinned himself, is far-fetched and unnatural. Second, the antithesis between the effects of the two principles is obliterated. Those who adopt the reading *ἁμαρτήσαντος*, propose different supplements. Grotius, and others, *θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν* [after *ἁμαρτήσ.*]; Bengel [Webster and Wilkinson, Stuart, Hodge], and others, *τὸ κρῖμα*; Reiche, after Theophylact, *τὸ κατάκριμα*; Fritzsche, and others, *παράπτωμα*; Beza, and others [after *ὡς*], *τό* (De Wette: and not like *that which resulted from* one who sinned, is the gift).‡ Rothe, Tholuck, and Meyer, supply merely *ἐστί* [after *δώρημα*]; Philippi, *ἐγένετο* [after *ἁμαρτήσ.*, and *ἐστί* after *δώρημα*.—P. S.]. This [which? *ἐστί*, or *ἐγένετο?*—P. S.] is sufficient with *ἁμάρτημα*, which means more than *ἁμαρτία*, and expresses the idea of guilt (*Verschuldung*) in connection with sin (see Mark iii. 28; Luke iv. 12, &c.).

For the judgment (passes) from one (transgression) to condemnation [τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρῖμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα. Lange supplies, from the preceding clause, *ἁμαρτήματος* after *ἐξ ἑνός*, and translates it, in both cases, *Verschuldung*.—P. S.] Here, too, the verb is wanting. Meyer supplies *ἐγένετο*, or *resulted*; De Wette *turned out*. But the verb is indicated by the *εἰς*. *εἰς* requires the idea of progress, development. (For the antithesis, Rothe has attempted to substitute an untenable division, *τὸ μέν*, *τὸ δέ*). The *κρῖμα* might mean judgment in general (Meyer),§ if it did not refer to *ἁμάρτημα*, by which it becomes judgment to punishment. Explanations: *reatus* (Beza,

* ["*Adamus et Christus, secundum rationes contrarias, conveniunt, in positivo; differunt, in comparativo.*"—P. S.]

* [The Codex Sinaiticus, in the octavo edition of Tischendorf (1865), reads ἁμαρτήσαντος, but this is a correction by a second or third hand. In the original MS. and the large uncial edition the word is broken by the line, and reads, ΑΜΑΡΤΗ-ΤΟΣ, which may be a mistake for ἁμαρτήματος, as well as for ἁμαρτήσαντος. The absence of the article before ἑνός is in favor of Lange's preference for ἁμαρτήματος, for Paul always uses the article when ἑνός refers to a person, except in ver. 12, where it is first introduced and connected with ἀνθρώπου.—P. S.]

† [Meyer: "*Es ist damit nicht so, als wenn es δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσ. (wie der Tod durch Adam) verursacht wäre (es ist vielmehr ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων zum δικαίωμα geworden).*" Meyer emphasises the *one* and *many*, and supplies simply *ἐστί* after *δώρημα*. Similar is the explanation of Rothe, Ewald, Van Hengel.—P. S.]

‡ [So also Alford, who supplies τὸ γενόμενον: "*And not as* (that which took place) *by one that sinned, so is the gift.*"—P. S.]

§ [Meyer: "*τὸ κρῖμα ganz allgemein: das Urtheil, welches Gott als Richter fällt. Denn zu was für einem Urtheil dieses in concreto ausgeschlagen ist, sagt erst das folgende εἰς κατάκριμα.*"—P. S.]

Cocceius); the threatened punishment, Gen. ii. 17 (Fritzsche, Tholuck); the sentence of punishment pronounced on Adam and his posterity, Gen. iii. 19 (Reiche, Baumgarten-Crusius [Rückert, De Wette], and others).—**From one (transgression).** We simply supply the foregoing ἁμάρτημα, and translate *the incurring of guilt*, because the deed is connected with its consequence, and the word is connected with the idea of guilt. ἐξ ἑνός is taken by Meyer as masculine.—**To condemnation** [εἰς κατάκριμα]. Explanations of the antithesis τὸ κρίμα, τὸ κατάκριμα: 1. Fritzsche: The threat of punishment, Gen. ii., and the sentence of punishment, Gen. iii.; similarly Tholuck. Reiche: the sentence of punishment pronounced on Adam, and that on his posterity. 2. Rückert: the Divine sentence and its result, death, was declared against the one who had sinned; but from him the sentence has extended to all. Plainly, the κρίμα, as the principle of judgment, proceeds from the one ἁμάρτημα of Adam, and passes through gradations of judgment to the κατάκριμα, which is completed ideally as the sentence of fitness for condemnation by the appearance of the gospel, and will be actually completed as real judgment to condemnation at the end of the world. Yet the antithesis here does not pass beyond the ideal judgment to condemnation. The antithesis of the one Adam and of the whole race, which Baumgarten-Crusius finds here, is only presumed; the numerical antithesis, rather, in this passage is ἓν ἁμάρτημα, πολλὰ παραπτώματα. It must be borne in mind that the expression παραπτώματα is much stronger than ἁμαρτήματα, and denotes the gradations of the one fall by many new apostasies (see the Second Commandment).

But the gift of grace (passes) from many falls (lapses) unto the good of justification [τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα, which Lange translates: *das Gnadengut aber geht von vielen Sündenfällen aus fort bis zum Rechtfertigungsgut*; or, in the *Exeg. Notes*, *Rechtfertigungsmittel*.—P. S.]. The personal charisma is Christ himself (see ver. 15), the source of all special gifts of grace (see Titus ii. 11).—**From many falls**, or **lapses** (*Sündenfällen*). Caused by them. As the κρίμα of Adam has become the universal κατάκριμα of humanity, so has the χάρισμα of Christ grown to be the universal and absolute δικαίωμα. As Christ, as the Risen One, has come forth ἐκ νεκρῶν, so has He, as the Just One, the personal δικαίωμα, come forth from the place of the παραπτώματα. It was thus with the advent of Christ on earth; but the finished παράπτωμα was the same crucifixion by which He was perfected as δικαίωμα. The usual explanations rest mostly on a misconception. Meyer: Since God declared sinners righteous. Augustine: *Quia non solum illud unum solvit, quod originaliter trahitur, sed etiam quæ in uno quoque homine motu propriæ voluntatis adduntur.* Better De Wette [and Alford]: "The gift of grace became, by occasion of many transgressions, justification." Philippi: "From out of many lapses." The δικαίωμα is neither the condition of righteousness (that would be δικαιοσύνη; Luther, Tholuck, and others), nor the declaration of God by which He executes the δικαίωσις (Meyer), but, according to Rückert and [Adelbert] Maier, the means or medium of justification (*Rechtfertigungsmittel*), which is in harmony with the form of the word. Meyer asks for the empirical proof; it lies right before us: Were δικαίωμα the real justification of mankind, κατάκριμα would be its real condemnation, and that would be a contradiction. Comp. also ver. 18, where the δικαίωμα is the presupposition of the δικαίωσις. (The explanation of Rothe, after Calvin: legal compensation in the sense of *satisfactio* is partly too general, and partly impinges very much on δικαίωσις). An elaborate discussion see in Tholuck, p. 258.

[Δικαίωμα, in Hellenistic usage, means usually *statutum*, *ordinance*, a *righteous decree*, or *righteous judgment* (*Rechtsspruch*, *Rechtsbestimmung*); comp. i. 32; ii. 26; viii. 4; Luke i. 6; Heb. ix. 1, 10; Apoc. xv. 4; or also (as in classical usage) a *righteous act*, a *just deed*, as Rev. xix. 8 (τὰ δικαιώματα τῶν ἁγίων); Baruch ii. 19 (δώσουσι δόξαν καὶ δικαίωμα τῷ κυρίῳ); comp. the Hebrew מִשְׁפָּט as distinct from צְדָקָה in Prov. viii. 20, where both are translated δικαιοσύνη in the Septuagint, while the Vulgate distinguishes them as *judicium* and *justitia*. I see no good reason for departing from this meaning. It is either, in opposition to κατάκριμα, the righteous *decree* which God declared on account of the perfect obedience of Christ; or it is, as ver. 18, in opposition to παράπτωμα, the righteous *act* of Christ as the objective basis (or, as Lange has it, the means) of our δικαίωσις. Tholuck, after a full discussion of the various interpretations, favors (p. 261) the translation, *Rechtfertigungsthat*, *actio justificativa*, which would differ from δικαίωσις, *justificatio*, as the accomplished fact differs from the process. Wordsworth explains it here, and in ver. 18, to mean a *state* of acceptance as righteous by God, a recognized *condition of approval*; but this is without any authority. The Latin Vulgate (*justificatio*, ver. 16, but *justitia*, ver. 18), the E. V., and even De Wette, Olshausen, Robinson (sub δικαίωμα, No. 3), Stuart, Alford, and Hodge, take δικαίωμα in ver. 16 as equivalent to δικαίωσις. (Alford: "As κατάκριμα is a sentence of condemnation, so δικαίωμα will be *a sentence of acquittal*. This, in fact, amounts to *justification*." Hodge: "It means *justification*, which is a righteous judgment, or decision of a judge, pronouncing one to be just.") Rothe (p. 108) calls this interpretation a piece of "exegetical levity;" and it is evident that, in ver. 18, δικαίωμα is distinguished from δικαίωσις. He goes back (with Pareus, J. Gerhard, Calov, Wolf, B. Carpzov) to classical usage, quoting a passage from Aristotle (*Eth. Nicom.* v. 10), who defines δικαίωμα to be τὸ ἐπανόρθωμα τοῦ ἀδικήματος, *the amendment of an evil deed*.* Rothe consequently translates it, *full satisfaction of justice*, *legal adjustment* (*Rechtserfüllung*, *Rechtsgutmachung*, *Rechtsausgleichung*). This meaning suits admirably here, and in

* [This passage affords a striking parallel, and has some bearing on the question whether Paul was acquainted with the works of the great Stagirite (which, from a remote resemblance of style, the mode of close, dialectic reasoning, from Paul's educational advantages in Tarsus, from his acquaintance with the spirit and working of the Hellenic philosophy, and even with inferior Greek authors, as Aratus and Cleanthes, Acts xvii. 28, Menander, 1 Cor. xv. 33 and Epimenides, Tit. i. 2, seems to me highly probable). I give it, therefore, in full. In his *Nicomachean Ethics* Book v. chap. 10 (according to Bekker's ed., ii. 1135; or chap. 7, in Didot's and other editions), Aristotle says: "Διαφέρει δὲ τὸ ἀδίκημα καὶ τὸ ἄδικον καὶ τὸ δικαίωμα καὶ τὸ δίκαιον· ἄδικον μὲν γάρ ἐστι τῇ φύσει ἢ τάξει· τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο, ὅταν πραχθῇ, ἀδίκημά ἐστι, πρὶν δὲ πραχθῆναι οὔπω, ἀλλ' ἄδικον. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ δικαίωμα. Καλεῖται δὲ μᾶλλον δικαιοπράγημα τὸ κοινόν, δικαίωμα δὲ τὸ ἐπανόρθωμα τοῦ ἀδικήματος. "An unjust act differs from the unjust (injustice in the abstract), and so does a *just act* from the (abstract) just: for a thing is unjust either

ver. 18 (where, however, the word is opposed to *παράπτωμα*, not, as in ver. 16, to *κατάκριμα*), and does not materially differ from the explanation of Lange. In ver. 18, *δικαίωμα*, being the opposite of *παράπτωμα*, and essentially equivalent to *ὑπακοή*, in ver. 19, must denote the *righteous deed*, *i. e.*, the *perfect obedience* of Christ, and is so understood by Calvin, Beze, Grotius, and Bengel. As it is not likely that the same word should be used in one breath in two different senses, it is safe to explain *δικαίωμα* in ver. 16 from its more obvious meaning in ver. 18. I prefer this (with Lange) to the other alternative chosen by Meyer (*Rechtfertigungsspruch*), Ewald (*Gerechtsspruch*), Van Hengel, Umbreit, who give it in both verses the meaning, righteous *decree*. I quote, in addition, the excellent note of Bengel on *δικαίωμα* in ver. 18, which throws light on its meaning in ver. 16: "*Δικαίωμα est quasi materia δικαιώσει (justificationi) substrata, obedientia, justitia præstita.* JUSTIFICAMENTUM *liceat appellare, ut ἑδραίωμα denotat firmamentum, ἔνδυμα vestimentum, ἐπίβλημα additamentum, μίασμα inquinamentum, ὀχύρωμα munimentum, περικάθαρμα purgamentum, περίψημα ramentum, σκέπασμα tegumentum, στερέωμα firmamentum, ὑπόδημα calceamentum, φρόνημα sentimentum, Gall. sentiment. Aristot. l.* v. *Eth. c* 10 *opposita statuit ἀδίκημα et δικαίωμα, atque hoc describit τὸ ἐπανόρθωμα τοῦ ἀδικήματος, id quod tantundem est atque* SATISFACTIO, *vocabulum Socinianis immerito invisum. Exquisitam verborum proprietatem schematismus exhibet:*

	A.	B.	C.	D.
Ver. 16.	*κρῖμα,*	*κατάκριμα·*	*χάρισμα,*	*δικαίωμα*
	A.	B.	C.	D.
Ver. 18.	*παράπτωμα,*	*κατάκριμα·*	*δικαίωμα,*	*δικαίωσις ζωῆς.*

In utroque versu A et B συστοιχεῖ, itemque C et D, sed A et C, ἀντιστοιχεῖ, itemque B et D. Versu 16 describitur negotium ex parte Dei: ver. 18 describitur ex parte Adami et Christi: idque in œconomia peccati minore verborum varietate, quam in œconomia gratiæ. δικαίωσις ζωῆς est declaratio divina illa, qua peccator, mortis reus, vitæ adjudicatur, idque jure."—P. S.]

B. *The contrast of potential, prospective effects.*

1. The contrast between the enslavement and negation of all *personal* life by *personified death*, and of the future glory of pardoned *persons* in the new life (ver. 17).

2. The contrast in all its ideal magnitude: owing to the power of the fall of one, judgment and condemnation came upon all men; all men can attain to justification of life (that is, not merely of faith) by the justifying righteousness of one (ver. 18).

Ver. 17. **For if by one man's fall, &c.** [*Εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι, κ.τ.λ.*]. This verse (which Rothe has improperly treated as a parenthesis,* and which Er. Schmid has even conceived to be the contradiction of an opponent) is, in form, first of all a proof of the *δικαίωμα* and *κατάκριμα* in ver. 16; but it develops the consequence of the *δικαίωμα*, as of the *κατάκριμα*, to a new and glorious contrast. Here, now, the personal element in ver. 15 is united with the material one in ver. 16; yet the personal predominates. From one proceeded, through one offence, the tendency toward destruction; death tyrannized over and defaced the personal life, and threatened to extinguish it; but much more shall believers become by the one Christ, on the ground of the *δικαιοσύνη*, the *βασιλεύοντες*, the ruling, royal personalities in eternal life. The point of the antithesis is therefore *ἐβασίλευσεν* and *βασιλεύσουσιν*. The *πολλῷ μᾶλλον* is also here a logical conclusion, which involves the higher degree of real power, as brought out in the antitheses: *ἓν παράπτωμα*, and the opposite *ἡ περισσεία τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης*; to which is yet added the *λαμβάνοντες* in contrast with the bondage of the former slaves of death (Heb. ii. 14); then again, the nameless *εἷς* and the one Jesus Christ; and finally, to a certain extent, *ὁ θάνατος* and *ἡ ζωή*. Meyer well remarks: "Bear in mind that Paul does not say in the apodosis, in conformity with the protasis: *ἡ ζωὴ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τοὺς . . . λαμβάνοντας*, but, in harmony with the matter in question, and corresponding to the active nature of the relation, he places the subjects in the active first." This is the chief point just here. (Menochius: "*suavius et gloriosus sonat.*") Tholuck: "*To be ruled*, is a bound and passive condition, while, on the other hand, the quality of free movement lies in life. The eschatological idea of a ruling in the finished kingdom of God, was brought over by Christ in a more profound sense from Judaism (Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 29). Paul has especially appropriated it (1 Cor. iv. 8; vi. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 12)." Tholuck questions the right to make prominent, according to Thomas Aquinas, Grotius, Stier, and others, the element of subjective spontaneousness, here, "where the whole weight falls on the Divine work of grace." But the Apostle speaks of the self-active appropriation of the work of grace in the life of believers.

Ver. 18. **Therefore, as through the fall of one, &c.** [Better: **through one fall** (*ἑνός* in the neuter), *Ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα, οὕτω καὶ δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς*].*

by nature or by order (ordinance). But the very same thing which, when done, is an unjust act, is not so before it is done, but it is unjust. The same may be said of a *just act*. But the common term is rather *a deed justly done* (*δικαιοπράγημα*); but the correction of an unjust act is a *just act* (*δικαίωμα*)."—P. S.]

* [This is a slight mistake, occasioned by a statement of Tholuck (p. 261 f.). Dr. Rothe regards not ver. 17, but ver. 16, as a parenthesis (l. c. p. 132), and ver. 17 as a corroborative and explanatory reassumption of ver. 15, to which it corresponds in all its parts as follows:

Ver. 15.

εἰ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοί ἀπέθανον,
πολλῷ μᾶλλον
ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι
τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησ. Χρ. εἰς τ. π. ἐπερίσσευσεν.

Ver. 17.

εἰ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασ.,
πολλῷ μᾶλλον
οἱ τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος κ. τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης
διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησ. Χριστοῦ, κ.τ.λ.—P. S.]

* [The Greek is here, like an exclamation, as brief and concise as possible, and cannot be intelligibly rendered without supplying some words. The E. V. supplies, be-

This verse is, as Meyer and others remark, a resumption of the preceding contrasts compressed in one sentence (συλλογίζεται ἐνταῦθα τὸ πᾶν, Theodore of Mopsvestia). But we must not overlook the new contrast brought out here. (On the use of ἄρα οὖν, see Meyer.)* As far as the verb that is wanting is concerned, De Wette remarks: It is usual to supply here (likewise Rückert and Fritzsche), in the first member, τὸ κρίμα ἐγένετο, and in the second, τὸ χάρισμα ἐγένετο; but better, something indefinite, as ἐγένετο (thus Meyer and Tholuck); Winer, ἀπέβη. We call up the pregnant expressions in chap. ii. 28, 29, and repeat accordingly παράπτωμα after παραπτώματος, and δικαίωμα after δικαιώματος. ἀπέβη is sufficiently contained in εἰς. The contrast in that case is simply this: *The fall of one man* came ideally and dynamically as a fall *upon all men unto condemnation;* that is, by the common fall, all men would, without redemption, be subject to condemnation; on the other hand, the *δικαίωμα of one* came ideally and dynamically as *δικαίωμα upon all men unto justification of life* in the last judgment; that is, the δικαίωμα of Christ is sufficiently powerful to justify and perfect all men. Meyer [with Rothe, Ewald, Alford, Wordsworth.—P. S.] construes δι᾽ ἑνός here both times as neuter (one trespass, one sentence of justification), which Tholuck has properly rejected. The Greek writers, Theodoret and Theophylact [as also Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, E. V., Bengel, Fritzsche, Philippi, Hodge.—P. S.], have taken it as masculine.† Here, as in ver. 16, Meyer makes the δικαίωμα to mean judgment of justification (*Rechtfertigungsspruch*), and rejects the translations: *fulfilment of the right* (*Rechtserfüllung*, Rothe and Philippi); *deed of justification* (*Rechtfertigungsthat*, Tholuck); *virtuousness* (*Tugendhaftigkeit*, Baumgarten-Crusius); *obedience* (*Gehorsam*, De Wette); the *recte factum* of Christ (Fritzsche). It is simply the same everywhere. If it be said that Christ is our righteousness, it is the same as saying that Christ is the personal medium of our justification. [Comp. the remarks on p. 184 f.—P. S.] The future ἀποβήσεται supplied by Winer and Philippi in the apodosis, is sufficiently implied in εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς. We hold that the Apostle here means the final δικαίωσις, *justification*, which, in the general judgment, constitutes the antithesis of the κατάκριμα, *condemnation*. The δικαίωμα is offered to all men, and the δικαίωσις ζωῆς is its purpose; but the realization of the purpose takes place merely according to the measure of faith. The Roman Catholic expositors assert that justification of *faith* itself is denoted here as justification of *life* [*i. e.*, progressive justification = sanctification.—P. S.] According to Calvin, and others, it is the justification whose result is life. Tholuck: The δικαίωσις with the effect of the future completion of life. Augustine likewise. Thomas Aquinas describes correctly the *ideal* universality of the δικαίωμα: "*Quamvis possit dici, quod justificatio Christi transit in justificationem omnium, ad* SUFFICIENTIAM, *licet quantum ad* EFFICIENTIAM *procedit in solos fideles.*"

[Πάντες ἄνθρωποι are, in both clauses, *all men* without exception, as in ver. 12; but this does not justify a Universalist inference, for Paul speaks of the *objective* sufficiency and intention of Christ's δικαίωμα, not of its *subjective* application to individuals, which depends upon the λαμβάνειν of faith, as intimated in ver. 17. The distinction drawn by Hofmann and Lechler between πάντες ἄνθρωποι, *all men without distinction*, and πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι, *all, without exception*, lacks proof (Meyer calls it, *rein erdichtet*). More of this in ver. 19.—P. S.]

C. *The Contrast of the Final Effects.*

Ver. 19. **For as through the disobedience of the one man**, &c. [Ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, οὕτως καί, κ.τ.λ. According to Meyer, ver. 19 furnishes only a grand and conclusive elucidation of ver. 18 (γάρ). Tholuck likewise, in harmony with Calvin. But this contrast denotes the final antithesis of the judgment and of justification as made *manifest* by the gospel (see chap. ii. 16). The sense is: As, in consequence of the disobedience of the one man Adam, the many (as many as there are) *have been presented* in the light of the gospel as sinners subject to condemnation, so, in consequence of the obedience of the one man Christ, shall the many (as many as believe) be

sides the verb *came*, two nouns, viz., *judgment* (κρίμα) and *free gift* (χάρισμα), from ver. 16. Lange supplies παράπτωμα and δικαίωμα from ver. 18, and translates: "*Demnach also: wie durch den Sündenfall des Einen* (*ein Sündenfall*) *auf alle Menschen* (*kommt*) *zur Verdammniss, so auch* (*kommt*) *durch Eines Rechtfertigungsgut* (*ein Rechtfertigungsgut*) *auf alle Menschen hin zur* (*wirklichen*) *Rechtfertigung des Lebens* (*welche Leben ist*)." Rothe takes ἑνός in both clauses not in the masculine, but in the neuter gender, and supplies only the verb *came*: "*Wie es durch Eine Uebertretung für alle Menschen zur Verdammniss* (*kommt*), *in eben derselben Weise* (*kommt es*) *auch durch Eine Rechtsgenugthuung für alle Menschen zur Rechtfertigung des Lebens.*" Meyer: "*Wie es also durch Ein Vergehen für alle Menschen zum Verdammungsurtheil* (*gekommen ist*); *so ist es auch durch Ein Rechtfertigungsurtheil für alle Menschen zur Rechtfertigung des Lebens* (*gekommen*)." Alford in the same way (except that he gives δικαίωμα a different meaning): "*Therefore as by means of one trespass* it came (ἐγένετο being supplied) *upon all men unto condemnation, so also by means of one righteous act* it came *upon all men unto justification of life.*" Wordsworth likewise takes ἑνός here as neuter, and translates: "*Therefore, as through one transgression* the sentence was *unto all men to condemnation, so through one state of acceptance* with God (so he interprets δικαίωμα), the sentence now is *unto all men to justification of life.*" Ewald most literally: "*Also denn—wie durch Einen Fehltritt für alle Menschen zur Verurtheilung, so auch durch Einen Gerechtspruch für alle Menschen zur Rechtfertigung von Leben.*" Dr. Hodge adopts the translation of the E. V., from which he very seldom departs. The new version of the Amer. Bible Union likewise agrees with the E. V. in supplying *judgment came*, and *free gift*, but more correctly renders δι᾽ ἑνὸς παραπτ., *through one trespass*, and δι᾽ ἑνὸς δικαιώματος, *through one righteous act*.—P. S.]

* [Meyer says: "ἄρα οὖν is conclusive: *demnach nun* (*accordingly then, so then, therefore now*); it is of frequent occurrence in Paul (vii. 3, 25; viii. 12; ix. 16, 18; xiv. 1?, 19; Gal. vi 10; Eph. ii. 19 *al.*), and, contrary to classical usage (Herm. *ad Antig.* 628, *ad Viger.* p. 823), at the beginning of the sentence." Klotz distinguishes between ἄρα and οὖν, in that the former "*ad internam potius causam spectat*," the latter "*magis ad externam.*" The ratiocinative force of ἄρα is weaker, and is supported by the collective power of οὖν. See Ellicott on Gal. vi. 10.—P. S.]

† [The antithesis εἰς πάντας, and the analogy of vers. 12, 15, 17, 19, where τοῦ ἑνός is masculine, are in favor of Lange's view, which is also that of the translators of the E. V.; but the absence of the article before ἑνός is almost conclusive against it; for in all the eight cases of this section, where it is indisputably masculine, it has uniformly the article (ver. 15, τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι . . . τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου; ver. 17, three times; ver. 19, twice), except in ver. 12, where it is connected with a noun (δι᾽ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου), and therefore unnecessary; while in ver. 16, where ἐξ ἑνός must be neuter, in opposition to πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων, it is, as here, without the article. The Apostle is therefore quite careful and consistent. The objection that the comparison is between Adam and Christ, rather than between the fall of one and the righteousness of another, does not hold, for it is clearly a comparison of both persons and effects. The E. V. has much obscured the force of this section by omitting the article throughout before εἰς, as also before πολλοί.—P. S.]

presented in the same light as just. It is self-evident that the effect of the gospel is included in the second clause; but from vers. 20 and 21 we must infer that it is presumed also in the first clause. It is only through the gospel that this ideal general judgment is brought to pass, by which all men are presented and exposed as condemned sinners in consequence of their connection with the sin of Adam (see John xvi. 8, 9; comp. Ps. li. 5, 6). We are authorized by the language in maintaining that *καθιστάνω* possesses here the full idea of setting down, exhibiting, making to appear as what one is. [See below.]

[**Through the disobedience of the one man,** *διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου*. The trespass, or fall, of Adam, *τὸ παράπτωμα*, is here definitely described as an act of *disobedience*, which is the mother of sin, as obedience to the Divine will is the mother of virtue; for disobedience is essentially selfishness in actual exercise, the rebellion of the human will against the Divine, the false self-assertion or independence in opposition to God, to whom we owe life and all, and whose service is true freedom.—P. S.]*

The many were constituted sinners [*ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν*].† Meyer: "According to ver. 12, they were, through Adam's disobedience, actually placed in the category of sinners, because they sinned in and with Adam's fall." This is Augustinian dogmatics, but no exegesis warranted by the context. [? see below.—P. S.] Tholuck: *Were made, became.* In this sense, according to his account, certain commentators have found the *imputatio forensis* expressed; others, a *real becoming*, in which the element of spontaneity is included. On the further complications which have arisen between Romish and Protestant commentators on the supposition of *really becoming*, see Tholuck, p. 268. The *παρακοή* of Adam himself has certainly set forth the many as sinners, but only because it has come into the light of the law, and finally of the gospel, and so far as it has now become clear: 1. As an ethico-physical causality, but not as a purely physical fatality; 2. So far as the offence of Adam has become the clear type of the sinfulness and sin of every man; 3. So far as the judgment of the finished revelation comprehends the many as in one.

So by the obedience of one shall the many be made (constituted) righteous [*οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί*]. That is, not merely by the death [the passive obedience] of Christ, but also by the [active] obedience of His whole life, which was finished in His death.* But why the future? Meyer: "It relates (corresponding to *βασιλεύσουσι*) to the future revelation of glory after the resurrection (Reiche, Fritzsche, Hofmann)." Tholuck also, together with Abelard, Cocceius, and others, refers the future to the final judgment. But the setting forth of believers as righteous extends from the beginning of the preaching of the gospel through all subsequent time. Beza properly observes, that the future denotes the *continua vis justificandi;* and Grotius, Calov., Rückert, De Wette, and Philippi, regard it similarly as a *præsens futuribile.* Tholuck objects: Is not objective justification a single act? Certainly, but only for individuals; but in the kingdom of God these acts are repeated through all the future to the end of the world.

[The interpretation of *ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν* (passive Aor. I.) and *δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται* has been much embarrassed and obscured by preconceived dogmatic theories. *Καθίστημι* (also *καθιστάω* and *καθιστάνω*) means: (1.) *to set down, to place* (this would give good sense here: to be set down in the rank of sinners; but see below); (2.) *to appoint, to elect* (this is inapplicable here, as it would make God directly the author of sin); (3.) *to constitute, to cause to be, to make* (*reddere aliquem aliquid*); hence the passive: *to be rendered, to become;* (4.) *to conduct, to accompany* on a journey (only once in the New Testament). Reiche has spent much learning to establish a fifth meaning: *to show, to exhibit;* but this is somewhat doubtful. The verb occurs twenty-two times in the New Testament, three times only in Paul (twice here, and once in Titus i. 5). In sixteen of these cases (including Titus i. 5) it clearly refers to official *appointment*, in one it means, *to accompany* (Acts xvii. 15); in the remaining five, viz., Rom. v. 19 (twice); James iii. 6; iv. 4; 2 Peter i. 8, it is, *to constitute, to render.* So it is taken in this verse by nearly all the recent commentators.† But in what sense? Figuratively, or really? Chrysostom, and the Greek commentators who did not believe in original sin, started the figurative or metonymic interpretation, which was subsequently more fully developed by the Arminians and Socinians (Grotius, Limborch, Wetstein, Socinus, Crell), and advocated also by Storr and Flatt, of the school of the older German supernaturalism, namely, that *κατεστάθησαν ἁμαρτωλοί* means: they were only *apparently* made sinners, or *accounted, regarded*, and *treated* as sinners—*i. e.*, exposed to the punishment of sin, *without actually being sinners.*‡ The same view has been strenu-

* [Tholuck quotes here the quaint and pointed remark of Luther: "*Wohl setzt Adam seinen Zahn in einen Apfel, aber in Wahrheit setzt er ihn in einen Stachel, welcher ist das göttliche Gebot.*" Bengel says that *παρά*, in *παρακοή*, very appositely points out the principle of the initial step, which ended in Adam's fall, namely, the carelessness of his understanding and will, which simultaneously gave way; as the first step towards the capture of a city is remissness on the part of the guards on watch.—P. S.]

† [Vulgate: *peccatores constituti sunt.* So also Calvin. E. V.: *were made sinners.* Lange translates: *als Sünder herausgestellt worden sind, set forth, made to appear* (*in their real character*) *as sinners.* So also Ewald: *als Sünder dargestellt wurden.* Meyer and Philippi: "*als Sünder hingestellt, in die Kategorie von Sündern versetzt wurden,*" *set down in the rank*, or *category, of sinners.* Alford (with De Wette): "*were made* actual sinners by practice, not, 'were accounted as' (Grotius, *al.*); nor 'became by imputation' (Beza, Bengel); nor 'were proved to be' (Koppe, Reiche, Fritzsche)."—P. S.]

* [Meyer refers *ὑπακοή*, as the opposite of Adam's *παρακοή*, specifically to the expiatory death of Christ, which was *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, His obedience to the will of God; Phil. ii. 8. But Lechler, Hofmann, Stuart, Barnes, and others, agree with Lange.—P. S.]

† [Philippi doubts the meaning *reddere, facere*, in the N. T., and insists upon the fundamental meaning (1.) *to set down, sistere, constituere, hinstellen, einsetzen*, and translates: *in die Kategorie von Sündern gesetzt werden.* But also in this case the setting down or the imputation must be based on the fact that they *really* are sinners, and so it is taken by Philippi.—P. S.]

‡ [Chrysostom is generally set down as the first advocate of this interpretation, but it should be remembered that he puts the metonymy not in the verb *κατεστάθησαν* but in the noun *ἁμαρτωλοί*, which he makes to mean obnoxious to punishment and condemned to death, *καταδεδικασμένοι θανάτῳ.* He says that the Apostle designed merely to state the fact, that all became mortal through Adam, but not the why and wherefore (*Hom.* x. Tom ix., p. 523, ed Bened.) It is unnecessary to prove that

ously advocated even by so sound and orthodox a commentator as Dr. Hodge, but from the very opposite doctrinal standpoint, and in the interest of immediate forensic imputationism. He takes *κατεστάθησαν*, like *ἥμαρτον*, ver. 12, in a purely legal and forensic sense: they were regarded as sinners independently of, and antecedently to, their being sinners, simply on the ground of the sin of Adam, their federal representative; as, on the other hand, they are regarded as righteous solely on the ground of Christ's righteousness, without any personal righteousness of their own.* This interpretation, though less artificial than the corresponding passive rendering of *ἥμαρτον*, ver. 12, is not supported by a single passage of the New Testament where *καθίστημι* occurs, and conflicts with the connection For ver. 19 gives the reason (*γάρ*) for the statement in ver. 18, why "judgment came upon all men to condemnation," and it would be sheer tautology to say: they were condemned because "they were regarded and treated as sinners." The phrase, then, can be taken only in the real sense, like *ἥμαρτον* in ver. 12. It means: they were made sinners either by virtual participation in the fall of Adam, or by actual practice, by repeating, as it were, the fall of Adam in their sinful conduct. Both interpretations are perfectly grammatical, and do not exclude each other. Even if the verb under consideration, in the passive, could be made out to mean: *to be exhibited, to appear* (*κατεστάθησαν* = *ἐφανερώθησαν*, see Wetstein, Reiche, Fritzsche), it always presupposes actual being: they were made to appear in their true character as sinners, or what they really were.* Comp. Lange above.† This is very different from: they were regarded and treated as sinners, without being such. The metonymic interpretation confounds the effect with the cause, or reverses the proper order that death follows sin. We are *regarded* and *treated* as sinners because we *are* sinners in fact and by practice. So, on the other hand, *δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται* is more than the declaratory *δικαιωθήσονται*, and means, that by Christ's merits we shall be actually made righteous and appear as such before His judgment seat. It denotes the righteousness of *life*, as a consequence of justification by faith (comp. *εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς*, ver. 18). Luther says: "*Wie Adam's Sünde unsere* EIGENE *geworden ist, also auch Christi Gerechtigkeit;*" as Adam's sin has become our *own*, so also Christ's righteousness. Calvin correctly translates: "*peccatores constituti sunt, . . . justi constituentur,*" and remarks *in loc.*: "*Unde sequitur, justitiæ qua istatem esse in Christo: sed nobis acceptum ferri, quod illi proprium est.*" David Pareus, one of the ablest among the older Reformed commentators, explains *δίκαιοι καταστ.*: "*multo plus est, quam justificabuntur. Nam justificari est a condemnatione absolvi justitia imputata; justum constitui est etiam justitia habituali sanctificari, hoc est, simul justificationis et sanctificationis beneficium complectitur.*" Bengel *in loc.*: "*Apostolus talem justorum* CONSTITUTIONEM *videtur prædicare, quæ justificationis actum subsequatur, et verbo* INVENIRI *includitur* (Phil. iii. 9; *coll.* Gal. ii. 17);" *i. e.*, the Apostle seems to set forth such a *constituting* of men as righteous, as may follow upon the act of justification, and as is included in the expression, *being found*. Alford: "*be made righteous*, not by *imputation* merely, any more than in the other case; but, 'shall be made really and actually righteous, as completely so as the others were made really and actually sinners.' When we say that man has no righteousness *of his own*, we speak of him as *out of Christ:* but *in Christ*, and united to Him, he is *made righteous*, not by a fiction or *imputation only* of Christ's righteousness, but by a real and living spiritual union with a righteous head, as a righteous member, righteous *by means of*, as an effect of, the righteousness of that head, but not merely righteous by transference of the righteousness of that head; just as, in his natural state, he is united to a sinful head as a sinful member, sinful by means of,

ἁμαρτωλός, in the N. T., means a real sinner, and nothing else. Grotius explains Rom. v. 19: "Here again is a metonymy. They were so treated as though they had actually sinned; that is, they were subject to death. So the word 'sinner' is used in 1 Kings i. 21, and elsewhere." So also Whitby, one of the best English commentators of the Arminian school.—P. S.]

* [Dr. Hodge, though otherwise a strict Calvinist, rejects the realistic Augustinian view of a fall of the whole race in Adam, and yet makes all the descendants of Adam legally responsible for his fall. To maintain this ground of an exclusively forensic imputation, he must resort to this forced interpretation of *ἥμαρτον* and *κατεστάθησαν*. "*Καθίστημι*," he says (p. 271), "never [!] in the N. T. means to *make*, in the sense of effecting or causing a person or thing to be in its character or nature other than it was before. *Καθιστάναι τινα ἁμαρτωλόν* does not mean, to make one sinful, but to set him down as such, to regard or appoint him to be of that class." [*To regard*, and *to appoint* are two very different things.—P. S.] "Thus, when Christ is said to have been 'constituted the Son of God,' He was not made Son, but declared to be such." [But in this passage, Rom. i. 4, *ὁρισθέντος* is used, not *κατασταθέντος*, and even that means more than *declared*; see *Textual Note* [8] on p. 56.] "'Who constituted thee a ruler or judge?'—*i. e.*, Who appointed thee to that office? So, 'Whom his lord made ruler.'" [These two passages, Matt. xxiv. 45; Acts vii 35, imply that neither was a ruler before being *appointed*, and they would lose their force, were we to substitute *regarded* for *constituted*.] "When, therefore, the Apostle says that the many were constituted (*κατεστάθησαν*) sinners by the disobedience of Adam, it cannot mean that the many thereby were rendered sinful, but that his disobedience was the ground of their being placed in the category of sinners. It constituted a good and sufficient reason for so regarding and treating them. The same remark applies, of course, to the other clause of this verse: *δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί*. This cannot mean, that by the obedience of one the many shall be made holy. It can only mean, that the obedience of Christ was the ground on which the many are to be placed in the category of the righteous—*i. e.*, shall be so regarded and treated. It is not our personal righteousness which makes us righteous, but the imputation of the obedience of Christ. And the sense in which we are here declared to be sinners, is not that we are such personally (which indeed is true), but by the imputation of Adam's disobedience." With the same assurance, as in ver. 12 (see p. 178), Dr. Hodge claims that this dogmatic exegesis is the obvious grammatical meaning of the passage, "adopted by commentators of every class, as to theological opinion." Of all respectable modern commentators, Philippi (a high-church Lutheran) is the only one who *apparently* favors it by pressing the meaning, *to set down*, as distinct from *reddere, facere*, but he does so in the *realistic* Augustinian sense, which he expressly vindicates in the interpretation of *ἥμαρτον* (see p. 178). De Wette calls the Socinian interpretation of *κατεστάθησαν* *false*, and Meyer insists that the verb means, "*die wirkliche Einsetzung in den Sünderstand, wodurch sie zu Sündern* THATSACHLICH GEWORDEN SIND, *peccatores constituti sunt;*" and he quotes James iv. 4; 2 Peter i. 8; Heb. v. 1; viii 3, where the metonymic sense is impossible.—P. S.]

* [Tholuck, p. 267: "*So ergiebt sich denn für das Pass nicht die Bedeutung: 'dargestellt werden' im Sinne von* 'ERSCHEINEN ALS ETWAS, *was man nicht ist,' sondern* 'GEMACHT WERDEN, WERDEN."—P. S.]

† [The latest commentator of Rom. v., Ad. Stölting (*Beiträge zur Exegese der Paulinischen Briefe*, Göttingen, 1869, p. 40), nearly agrees with Lange in giving the verb a special reference to the judgment. "*Κατεστάθησαν*," he says, "*hat hier die ganze Bedeutung des Hinstellens vor* DEN RICHTER, *wie ja die richterliche Thätigkeit Gottes auf Adamitischer Seite im Vorhergehenden durch κρίμα und κατάκριμα auf das klarste bezeichnet ist.*'—P. S.

as an effect of, the sinfulness of that head, but not merely by *transference* of the sinfulness of that head."—P. S.]

On the question raised by Tholuck, and others, whether this passage does not lead to the doctrine of the ἀποκατάστασις, see *Doct. and Ethical*, No. 12.

[The inference of a *universal salvation* from this verse, as also from ver. 15 (εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσεν) and 18 (εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς), is very plausible on the surface, and might be made quite strong if this section could be isolated from the rest of Paul's teaching on the terms of salvation. The same difficulty is presented in 1 Cor. xv. 22: "As in Adam all die (πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν), so in Christ shall all be made alive (πάντες ζωοποιηθήσονται)." It has been urged by some that the apocatastasis is implied partly in the indicative future, κατασταθήσονται and ζωοποιηθήσονται, but especially in the fact that, as πάντες, *all*, and οἱ πολλοί, *the many*,* are confessedly unlimited in the first clause, we have no right to limit them in the second clause. (The advocates of eternal punishment forcibly derive the same argument for their doctrine from the double αἰώνιος, Matt. xxv. 46). The popular explanation that πάντες and οἱ πολλοί means, in one case, Adam's *natural* seed (οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί), in the other, Christ's *spiritual* seed (*i. e.*, οἱ πιστεύοντες), though true as to practical result, fails to do justice to the superabundance of God's grace over man's sin. Paul unquestionably teaches emphatically the universal *sufficiency* of the gospel salvation, without any restrictions which might break the force of the parallel between Adam and Christ.† All men are capable of salvation, or salvable (*erlösbar*), which must by all means be maintained against Manichæism and fatalism. If any are ultimately lost, it is not from metaphysical or constitutional inability, nor from any defect in Christ's atonement, which is of infinite value in itself, and was made for the sins of the *whole* world (1 John ii.2), nor from any unwillingness on the part of God, who, according to His *benevolent* purpose, will have *all* men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth (1 Tim. ii. 4; comp. iv. 10; 2 Peter iii. 9). But we must make a distinction between the *objective sufficiency* and the *subjective efficacy* of Christ's atonement, between the *possibility* and the *actuality* of a universal salvation. All men *may* be saved, since abundant provision has been made to that end, and under this view we must approach even the worst sinner; but which, and how many, *will* be saved, is a question of the future which God only knows. From the great stress which Paul lays in this passage on the superabundance of grace which greatly exceeds the evils of the fall, we have a right to infer that by far the greater part of the race will ultimately be saved, especially if we take into consideration that the half of mankind die in infancy before having committed actual transgression, and that, in the days of millennial glory, the knowledge of Christ will cover the earth. It is a truly liberal and noble sentiment of Dr. Hodge when he says (p. 279): "We have reason to believe that the lost shall bear to the saved no greater proportion than the inmates of a prison do to the mass of the community." But from all our present observation, as well as from the word of God (comp. Matt. vii. 13, 14), we know that many, very many—yea, the vast majority of adults even in Christian lands—walk on the broad path to perdition, although they may yet be rescued in the last moment. Paul himself speaks of the *everlasting punishment* of those who obey not the gospel of Christ (2 Thess. i. 9), and teaches a resurrection of the *unjust* as well as of the just (Acts xxiv. 15). We know, moreover, that none can be saved except by *faith*, which is God's own express condition. For salvation is a moral, not a mechanical process, and requires the free assent of our will. Now Paul everywhere presents faith as the subjective condition of justification; and in ver. 17 he expressly says, that those who *receive* (λαμβάνοντες) the abundance of the grace and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by the one, Jesus Christ. He contrasts the whole generation of Adam and the whole generation of Christ, and, as the one die in consequence of their participation in Adam's sin, so the other shall be made alive by virtue and on condition of their union with Christ's righteousness. In Gal. iii. 22 he states the case beyond the possibility of mistake: "The Scripture hath concluded *all* (τὰ πάντα) under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that *believe* (τοῖς πιστεύουσιν)."—Universalism must assume a second probation after death even for those who lived in Christian lands, with every opportunity of saving their soul. But such an assumption is contrary to Gal. vi. 7, 8, and the whole practical tenor of the Bible, and is in itself untenable and illusive. A new trial, instead of improving, would greatly lessen the chance of building up a good character. For as it is impossible, without a new creation, to return to the mother's womb and live the old life over again, the second trial would have to commence where the first left off—that is, with a dismal outfit of neglected opportunities, broken vows, sad reminiscences, abused faculties, bad habits, and in the corrupting company of moral bankrupts, with every prospect of a worse failure and a more certain ruin. God wisely and mercifully gave to men but one state of probation, and those who improved it best, would shrink most from running the risk of a second.—P. S.]

THIRD PARAGRAPH (VERS. 20, 21).

How the law is designed to bring about directly this process of the development of sin, in order also to bring about indirectly the revelation of grace.

Ver. 20. **But the law.** [Νόμος δέ, κ.τ.λ. The Mosaic law is meant, though the article is wanting, as is often the case where there can be no mistake.—P. S.] The Apostle now cannot avoid to state the relation of the law or of Moses to this antithesis—Adam and Christ—especially since he has

* [The E. V. has much obscured the meaning by omitting the article before *many*, as if it were antithetical to *some*, while *the many* are opposed to *the one*, ὁ εἷς.—P. S.]

† [According to Rothe, l. c. p. 155, Paul meant to suggest the idea of the *possibility* of the ultimate salvation of all men, but no more. "VÖLLIG BESTIMMT UND UNZWEIDEUTIG WILL *der Apostel* NUR *die reale Möglichkeit der Beseligung Aller durch Christi* δικαίωμα *aussagen; allein dabei* WILL *er doch zugleich* MIT VÖLLIG BEWUSSTER ABSICHT (*und er erreicht diese Absicht durch das* γάρ *einerseits und durch das zweimalige* οἱ πολλοί *andrerseits*), *in dem Leser die* BESTIMMTE VERMUTHUNG *erregen, dass auch die geschichtliche Verwirklichung jener realen Möglichkeit von ihm mitgemeint sein möge*; ABER AUCH EBEN NUR ALS VERMUTHUNG, *die er durchaus nicht soll aus dem Gebiet der blossen Wahrscheinlichkeit in das der Evidenz hinüberziehen können. Gewiss, die meisterliche Kunst in der Durchführung dieser so fein nüancirten Intention ist wohl zu bewundern.*" —P. S.]

already intimated this relation in ver. 13. Grotius thought the following discussion induced by an objection. But chaps. vi. and vii. show that Paul could not avoid to answer this question.—**Came in between** [*zwischenein, parenthetically*, as it were] *παρεισῆλθεν*. Not *besides, thereto* (Meyer);* nor *subintravit* (Vulg.);† nor *incidentally, subordinately* (*nebensächlich*, Rothe,‡ Tholuck [Reiche, Philippi], and others [contrary to the pedagogic mission of the law; iii. 20; Gal. iv. 24]). The *coming to, in addition to*, lies in the *παρά*; the *coming into*, in the *εἰς*. Therefore, properly to *enter between, to come between* [Adam and Christ] (Theodoret, Calvin, Luther [Estius,§ Grotius, Usteri, Ewald], &c.), which Meyer opposes without warrant. The reference to the position of Moses between Adam and Christ may, indeed, be only an intimation; but to say that sin merely supervened in addition to sin (Beza, De Wette, &c.), is not satisfactory, because the question in the foregoing is not concerning sin alone, but the antithesis of sin and grace. Tholuck concludes incorrectly from this consideration, that the law is characterized as an incidental factor. The law incidental? (Chrysostom [Theophylact, Cornelius a Lapide, without any foundation], have understood *παρά* as denoting *obiter, ad tempus*). The Apostle has evidently the idea of an ethico-chemical process. The law had to enter into the process of the development of sin, in order to force it to a crisis. [Olshausen: "Paul regards the law as a salutary medicine, which forces the disease that rages in the inward, nobler parts, to the surface." So also De Wette and Rothe.—P. S.]

That the fall might multiply [*ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα*; Lange: *damit der Sündenfall völliger werde* (*erscheine*); Alford: *in order that the trespass might multiply*. The Apostle uses *παράπτωμα* here (not *παραπτώματα*, nor *ἁμαρτία*), because the law does not aim to multiply sin as such, but to make it appear and to reveal it to the conscience as a *παράπτωμα*—*i. e.*, a transgression of the positive will of God; comp. iii. 20; iv. 15; vii. 7; and Rothe, p. 167.—P. S.]. The boldness of this thought has troubled the commentators. It is indeed not satisfactory to alleviate it by supposing that the law is intended merely to enhance the knowledge of sin (Grotius, Baur, and others); but this is one important element of its mission (see chap. vii.), and must not be rejected, with Meyer, as false. To explain *ἵνα* of the consequence or result (merely *ἐκβατικῶς*, with Chrysostom [*οὐκ αἰτιολογίας, ἀλλ' ἐκβάσεως*; Estius: "*non finalem causam denotat, sed eventum.*"—P. S.], Koppe, Reiche [Stuart, Barnes]), is likewise unsatisfactory; yet the Apostle has certainly inferred from the result the design and intention in the *ἵνα*.* Gal. iii. 19 does not serve as an elucidation of this passage, as Meyer would have it; and Rom. vii. 14 proves that, by the law, the knowledge of sin comes; while 1 Tim. i. 9 shows that the law constitutes a weapon against the ungodly. Reiche has called the telic construction *blasphemous*; in reply to which, comp. Meyer [p. 224]. He properly remarks, that sin had to reach its culminating point, where it will be outdone by grace. Only this culminating point should not be merely objective, but subjective also, in accordance with the sentence quoted from Augustine, on Ps. cii.: "*Non crudeliter hoc fecit Deus, sed consilio medicinæ; . . . augetur morbus, crescit malitia, quæritur medicus et totum sanatur.*" It is a fact both that the misunderstood law, according to God's decree, induced the crucifixion of Christ—the climax of the world's guilt—and that the same law, well understood, prepared the way for the saving faith of the New Testament. For this reason there is truth in Rothe's explanation: All sin should ever stand out more complete under the form of the *παράπτωμα*. Tholuck also takes ground with Olshausen, De Wette, and Neander, in favor of the telic rendering. Reasons: 1. *Nitimur in vetitum*; 2. Thomas: "When the passions dare not manifest themselves, they become more intense." Does this apply here? Sin, even in the form of anti-Christianity, undoubtedly becomes more intense in opposition to the gospel, but still this is mostly ecbatic consequence; 3. Luther: The accusing and condemning law awakens enmity to God. For this reason, Judaism, like all fanaticism, *is angry* at God. It is a prime consideration that here the law is specifically understood as the law of the letter, as designed to finish, both objectively and subjectively, the sinful process of the old world. Therefore the second *ἵνα* in ver. 21, as Tholuck well remarks, takes the sting from the first. [In other words, the first *ἵνα* indicates the mediate, the second *ἵνα* the ultimate end and purpose.—P. S.] Philippi understands by *παράπτωμα* merely the *παράπτ.* of Adam inhering in sinners. But it denotes here rather the completion of the fall of humanity itself.

But where sin multiplied [*οὗ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία*]. Where it was completed, came to full revelation. It is very strange that Rothe regards the head of the whole deduction from *οὗ δὲ* to *χάρις* as parenthetical. *Οὗ* is not temporal (Grotius [De Wette, Fritzsche, Stölting]), but spacial (Meyer, Tholuck)—perhaps both; time being considered as an expansion.—[**Grace exceedingly abounded** (not, **much more**, E. V.), *ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις*]. *ὑπερεπερισσεύειν* [*supra modum redundavit*] is superlative [not comparative; comp. *ὑπερπλεονάζω, ὑπερνικάω, ὑπερυψόω, ὑπερλίαν*]; (2 Cor. vii. 4 [the same verb] 1 Tim. i. 14; Mark vii. 37; 2 Thess. i. 3).

Ver. 21. **That, as sin reigned in** [not **unto**, E. V.; Lange, *mittelst, by means of*] **death** [*ἵνα*,

* [As *προσετέθη*, Gal. iii. 19. Beza: *præterea introiit*, supervened, came in the way of addition. Meyer: *es kam noch daneben ein*, viz., in addition to sin, which had already entered into the world, ver. 12. Similarly Alford: "*came in besides* the fact of the many being made sinners, and as a transition-point to the other result." Hodge: The law was superinduced on a plan already laid, and for a subordinate (?) although necessary purpose.—P. S.]

† [The idea of *secrecy*, or *surreptitious* entrance, is not necessarily implied in *παρά* (comp. *παρεισάγω, παρεισδύω, παρεισφέρω*), and must be either derived from the context, as in Gal. ii. 4 (the only passage in the New Testament where the verb occurs besides our own), or be expressed by *λάθρᾳ*. In our passage such an idea would be inconsistent with the holy character of the law, the solemn manner of its promulgation, and the Apostle's reverence for it (Rom. vii. 12 ff.). From Meyer.—P. S.]

‡ [Rothe, p. 158, translates: *nebenbei zwischenein gekommen*, it came in *incidentally between*. He thus combines the idea of the incidental coming in of the law with that of its medial position between Adam and Christ. So Olshausen: "*In dem παρεισῆλθεν ist sowohl das mitten inne Treten, als auch das Beiläufige, nicht absolut Nothwendige desselben angedeutet.*"—P. S.]

§ [Estius: "*Lex, prohibens peccatum, medio tempore inter Adam et Christum subingressa est.*"—P. S.]

* [Meyer, who is a philological purist even to occasional pedantry, takes *ἵνα* here, and everywhere, *τελικῶς*, and thus seems to justify even the supralapsarian theory of sin. Alford likewise insists on the uniform telic meaning of *ἵνα*. It undoubtedly denotes the design here, but the *mediate* not the *ultimate* design, as in ver. 21.—P. S.]

ὥσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ. The second ἵνα indicates the more remote and ultimate purpose of the coming in of the law, as the first ἵνα, ver. 20, denotes its nearer and mediate aim and effect; the increase of sin served merely as a means for the triumphant and eternal reign of grace. Hodge: "The design of God in permitting sin, and in allowing it to abound, was to bring good out of evil; to make it the occasion of the most wonderful display of His glory and grace, so that the benefits of redemption should infinitely transcend the evils of the apostasy."—P. S.] **As sin wrought death, so again did death work sin** (see Heb. ii. 14). But here the priority in the βασιλεία is ascribed to sin. It *reigned* [aor., the historic past]. It reigns no more. ἐν before θανάτῳ is not a substitute for εἰς (Beza, and others). Meyer opposes also the explanation: by death (Tholuck, Philippi). Death denotes the sphere of the dominion of sin. But death is also the medium of the reign of sin; see the antithesis, διὰ δικαιοσύνης.

So also grace may reign, &c. [οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ, κ.τ.λ.] The law would thus bring to pass the dominion of grace; and it now reigns in reality. The material medium is **righteousness unto** (leading to) **life eternal**; the personal medium is **Jesus Christ our Lord**; and both are identical. The δικ., and not the ζωή, is named as the medium of the dominion of grace, because the ζωὴ αἰώνιος is the goal. The righteousness of faith and the righteousness of life are comprised here in the idea of the δικ. (βασιλεύσῃ is aorist, not future. Meyer against Reiche, see Col. iii. 4.)

[The last word in this section is, **Jesus Christ our Lord**, the one glorious solution of the Adamic fall and the dark problem of sin. Adam disappears, and Christ alone remains master of the field of battle, having slain the tyrants, Sin and Death. Forbes concludes his notes on Rom. v. 12–21 with the exclamation (p. 257): "Who can rise from the study and contemplation of this wondrous passage, full of such profound views and pregnant meanings, with all its variously complicated yet beautifully discriminated relations and interlacements of members and thoughts, without an overpowering admiration and irresistible conviction of the *superhuman* wisdom that must have dictated its minutest details!"—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

[LITERATURE ON THE DOCTRINAL QUESTIONS INVOLVED IN ROM. V. 12–21.—The authoritative *Creed statements* on anthropology and hamartiology from the Synod of Orange, A. D. 529 (comp. my *Church Hist.*, vol. iii. pp. 866 ff.) to the Westminster Assembly, 1643. To these may be added two quasi-creeds of sectional and temporary authority, drawn up in the interest of immediate imputationism, viz., the decree of the French Reformed Synod of Charenton, 1645 ("*Decretum Synodi nationalis Ecclesiarum Reformatarum Galliæ A. D.* 1645 *de imputatione primi peccati omnibus Adami posteris, cum ecclesiarum et doctorum protestantium consensu, ex scriptis eorum ab* ANDREA RIVETO *collecto*," in the *Opera Theol.* of A. RIVET, Roterod. 1660, tom. iii. pp. 798–827); and the *Formula consensus Helvetica*, 1675 (in NIEMEYER'S *Collectio Confess. Reform.*, pp. 720–739). Comp., in part, WINER'S *Comparative Symbolik*, pp. 53 ff., where the principal passages from the symbolical books are collected.—The numerous works of AUGUSTINE against Pelagius and Julian of Eclanum. ANSELM, *De conceptu virginali et orig. peccato.* RIVET, *Theses theologicæ de peccato originis* (*Opera*, tom. iii. pp. 804 sqq.) President EDWARDS, *On Original Sin* (*Works*, vol. ii. 303–583.) JUL. MÜLLER, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin* (the most exhaustive work on the subject, now accessible also to the English reader in an intelligible translation, from the 5th German edition, by Rev. W. URWICK, Edinb., 1868). EBRARD, *Christl. Dogmatik* (1851), i. pp. 511 ff.; *Kirchen- und Dogmen-Geschichte* (1866), ii. 504 ff., 538 ff. HEPPE, *Dogmatik der evang. reform. Kirche aus den Quellen* (1861), pp. 204 ff. CHS. HODGE (Princeton). *Theol. Essays*, New York, 1846, Nos. vi.–viii. on Imputation, pp. 128 ff.; in *Princeton Rev.* for April, 1860 pp. 335 ff., and revised edition of *Romans* (1864), pp. 279–284 ARCHIBALD ALEX. HODGE (Alleghany), *Outlines of Theology*, New York, 1860, chap. xvi., pp. 230–246. R. W. LANDIS, several articles in the *Danville Review*, from Sept. 1861 to Dec 1862. SHEDD, *History of Christian Doctrine* (1863), ii. 152 ff (and essay on *Original Sin*, in his "Discourses and Essays," pp. 218–271). SAM. J. BAIRD, *The First Adam and the Second The Elohim Revealed in the Creation and Redemption of Man*. Philad., 1860, pp. 11–50, 305 ff., 410 ff., 474 ff. G. P. FISHER, *The Augustinian and the Federal Theories of Original Sin compared*, in the *New Englander* for 1868, pp. 468 ff.—P. S.]

1. On the internal connection of the section, as well as its organic relations to what precedes and follows, compare the inscription and the introductory foundation of the *Exeg. Notes*.

[2. HISTORICAL STATEMENTS ON THE DIFFERENT THEORIES OF ORIGINAL SIN AND IMPUTATION.—The Apostle clearly teaches, and our religious experience daily confirms, the fact of the universal dominion of sin and death over the human race, which dominion goes back in unbroken line to our first parents; as, on the other hand, the power and principle of righteousness and life go back to Jesus Christ, the second Adam. Sin existed before Christianity, as disease existed before the science and art of healing; and, however explained, the stubborn, terrible fact remains. It is all-important, as we stated in the introductory remarks, to distinguish clearly between the fact itself and the different modes of explanation, or between the primitive truths of the Bible and the after-thoughts of human philosophy and theology. Here lies the reason why Christian men, holding very divergent views on the why and wherefore, or the rationale of Scripture truths, may yet in their inmost heart and religious experience be agreed. The commentators have so far dwelt mainly on the *negative* clause of Paul's parallelism, viz., the propagation of sin and death from Adam; but he lays the chief stress upon the *positive* clause, the antitype, and the life-union of the justified believer with Christ, which prepares the way for chap. vi.

The following are the principal theories on this subject:

(1.) The PANTHEISTIC and NECESSITARIAN theory regards sin as an essential attribute (a limitation) of the finite, and a necessary stage in the development of character; it consequently destroys the radical antagonism between good and evil, and places itself outside of the Christian system. Where there is no real sin, there is no room for redemption.

(2.) The PELAGIAN heresy denies original sin, and resolves the fall of Adam into an isolated and comparatively trivial childish act of disobedience, which indeed set a *bad example*, but left his character and moral faculties essentially unimpaired, so that every child is born into the world as innocent and perfect, though as fallible, as Adam was created. It offers no explanation of the undeniable fact of the *universal* dominion of sin, which embraces every human being with the one solitary exception of Jesus of Nazareth. It rests on an atomistic anthropology and hamartiology, and is as anti-scriptural as the opposite extreme of pantheism. Socinianism, Unitarianism, and Rationalism likewise deny original sin and guilt in the proper sense of the term.

(3.) The assumption of a PRE-ADAMIC FALL of all men, either in time—*i. e.*, in a state of individual preëxistence of the soul prior to its connection with

the body (as Origen held it), or timeless and transcendental (so Dr. Jul. Müller: *ein ausserzeitlicher Urzustand und Urfall*). This is a mere hypothesis, without support in human consciousness, and inconsistent with the plain sense of Rom. v. 12, which, in harmony with Gen. iii., derives sin from the one historical Adam.

(4.) The AUGUSTINIAN OR REALISTIC theory of a real though impersonal and unconscious participation of the whole human race in the fall of Adam, as their natural head, who by his individual transgression vitiated the generic human nature, and transmitted it in this corrupt and guilty state to his descendants by physical generation. As an individual act, Adam's sin and guilt was his own exclusively, and is not transferable to any other individual; but as the act of mankind in their collective, undistributed, and unindividualized form of existence, it was, virtually or potentially, the act of all who were germinally or seminally contained in their first parent, as Levi was in the loins of Abraham (Heb. vii. 9, 10). *Persona corrumpit naturam, natura corrumpit personam.* In other words: Adam's individual transgression resulted in a sinful nature; while, in the case of his descendants, the sinful nature or depraved will results in individual transgressions. See the passages from Augustine quoted on p. 178, third foot-note. His view rests on his deep religious experience and his interpretation of Rom. v., but it presupposes, as a necessary prerequisite, the original organic unity of the human race, a distinction between person and nature (which must be made also in the doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation), and may be philosophically supported by the Platonico-Aristotelian realism concerning the doctrine of the general conceptions, as the original types of individual things.

This realistic view of the fall of the race in Adam became the orthodox doctrine of the Latin Church. It was defended by the great schoolmen, Anselm, Peter the Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, &c. (yet with a material modification of Augustine's conception of original sin and guilt, which scholastic theology made to consist only in the loss of original righteousness; viewing it more as a *negative* state of privation than as positive corruption). It was even more earnestly and vigorously maintained by the Reformers, both Lutheran and Calvinistic (who advocated afresh the Augustinian view of hereditary sin and guilt in all its severity). The various writings of Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, and the symbolical books of the sixteenth century, abound with quotations and reminiscences from Augustine on the doctrines of Sin and Grace.

But within the Augustinian system different views of *imputation* were developed, especially in the Reformed Church:

(*a.*) *Imputation, immediate and mediate,** conjoined and inseparable. This makes the guilt of Adam's first sin imputed, and the guilt of inherent depravity inseparable and conditional to one another. Both kinds of imputation are held in fact; but the distinction was not made before the seventeenth century. Participation is assumed as the ground of imputation. Nati e corruption is itself sin, and likewise punishment for guilt incurred in Adam's sin. Hereditary guilt coëxists with hereditary sin; man is condemned, both on account of the act of disobedience which he committed in the loins of Adam, and for hereditary depravity.

Here we must distinguish again a minor difference relating to the order of the two kinds of imputation:

(*aa.*) Some put *immediate* imputation *before* mediate in the order of things. So Augustine and his strict followers in the Catholic Church, and the Calvinists of the Montauban school, David Pareus, Andrew Rivet,* the elder Turretin,† and Heidegger;‡—with this difference, that the Dutch and French Calvinists of the seventeenth century combined, with the Augustinian theory of participation, the federal theory of representation (see below, No. 5); and, while still holding to both kinds of imputation, they laid the chief stress upon *immediate* imputation—thus preparing the way for *exclusive* immediate imputationism.

(*bb.*) Others give *mediate* imputation, or the imputation of inherent depravity, the logical priority, so that Adam's sin is imputed to us only because it becomes our own by propagation (to which some add, by actual transgression). Here belong, in all probability, Anselm among the schoolmen,§ Calvin,‖

* [The terminology *immediate* or *antecedent*, and *mediate* or *consequent* imputation, is traced by Turretin (*Instit.*, Pars I. p. 556, Locus IX. de peccato, Qu. X.) to Joshua de la Place, of Saumure (1596-1655), who was charged with inventing it to evade the force of the synodical decision of Charenton, 1645. Augustine and the Reformers did not use it, and hence there has been some dispute as to the side on which to place them.]

* [In opposition to Placæus, and in vindication of the decree of the Synod of Charenton, the distinguished Professor Rivet, of Leyden, made a collection of passages on imputation from the Reformed and Lutheran Confessions, and prominent divines, as Calvin, Beza, Bullinger, Wolfgang Musculus, Viret, Bucanus, Peter Martyr, Wolleb, Whittaker, Davenant, Zanchius, Olevianus, Ursinus, Pareus, Piscator, L. Crocius, Melanchthon, Chemnitz, Hunnius, and many others (including also Roman Catholics). But these testimonies are to a great extent general, and make no distinction between immediate and mediate imputation. The collection of Rivet is translated in part in the *Princeton Review*, vol. xi. (1839), pp. 553–579.]

† [Turretin (l. c. Pars I. p. 557) defines imputation thus: "*Imputatio vel est* RES ALIENÆ, *vel* PROPRIÆ. *Aliquando imputatur nobis id quod nostrum est personaliter, quo sensu Deus imputat peccata peccatoribus, quos propter propria crimina punit, et in bonis dicitur zelus Phineæ illi imputatus ad justitiam* (Ps. cvi. 31); *aliquando imputatur id quod est* EXTRA NOS, *nec a nobis est præstitum, quomodo justitia Christi dicitur nobis imputari, et peccata nostra ipsi imputantur, licet nec ipse peccatum in se habeat, nec nos justitiam.*"]

‡ [The *Formula consensus Helvetica*, a strongly partisan theological Confession, drawn up in 1675 by Heidegger of Zürich, at the solicitation of Turretin of Geneva, and Gernler of Basel, in opposition partly to the mediate imputationism of La Place, asserts that the *imputatio culpæ* is not the consequence, but the cause of the *propagatio vitiositatis*, or the *corruptio hereditaria*, and condemns the doctrine of those who "*sub imputationis mediatæ et consequentis nomine, non imputationem duntaxat primi peccati tollunt, sed hereditariæ etiam corruptionis assertionem gravi periculo objiciunt.*" Arts. x.–xii. (in Niemeyer's *Collect.*, p. 733). The same Confession teaches also a limited atonement, and verbal, even punctual inspiration; but it soon lost all authority. Ebrard (*Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte*, iii. p. 556) calls it, rather too severely, the "ridiculous after-birth of a symbolical book."]

§ [Anselm (*De conc. virg.*, c. 7) says we are not condemned because "we ourselves sinned in Adam, as we did not yet exist, but because we were to descend from him (*sed quia de illo futuri eramus*)."]

‖ [Calvin, on Rom. v. 17: "We are condemned for the sin of Adam not by imputation alone, as if the punishment of the sin of another were exacted of us (*peccato Adæ non per solam imputationem damnamur, acsi alieni peccati exigeretur a nobis pœna*), but we bear its punishment because we are guilty of the sin also (*quia et culpæ sumus rei*), in so far as our nature, vitiated in him, is held bound with the guilt of iniquity before God (*quatenus scilicet et natura nostra in ipso vitiata iniquitatis reatu obstringitur apud Deum*)." He then goes on to say, that we are in a different manner restored to salvation by the righteousness of Christ, viz., not because it is in us, but it is freely given to

and Bullinger among the reformers;* and, more clearly and expressly, Stapfer and President Edwards,† who are often inaccurately quoted as *mediate* imputationists; also the orthodox Lutherans of the seventeenth century.‡ It is certain that we have all to bear the *consequences* of Adam's sin, and this sin is therefore the *cause* of our native corruption; but it is not our personal *guilt* independently of this corruption, and our assent to it.

(*b.*) *Mediate* or *consequent* imputation makes inherent depravity derived from Adam, and this alone, the ground of condemnation. "*Vitiositas præcedit imputationem.*" So the Reformed school of Saumur, in France, especially Joshua Placæus (La Place), who denied that the imputation of Adam's sin was prior to, and independent of, inherent depravity, but who claimed to be in full harmony with the teaching of Calvin on this subject. This view, "so far as it restricts the nature of original sin to the mere hereditary corruption of Adam's posterity, excluding the imputation of the first sin by which he fell," was condemned by the French Reformed Synod at Charenton, near Paris, in 1645, yet without mentioning the name of Placæus, who contended that he was not touched by this decree, since he admitted a *mediate* imputation of Adam's sin, consequent and dependent on corruption.

(*c.*) *Immediate* or *antecedent* imputation as opposed to mediate imputation, makes, on purely legal grounds, the sin of Adam, as the sin of the federal head of the race, the only and exclusive ground of condemnation independently of, and prior to, native depravity and personal transgression; so that hereditary guilt precedes hereditary sin, and not *vice versâ*. This exclusive immediate imputationism is held by Calvinists of the supralapsarian and federal school, and gives up the Augustinian ground of participation. See below, No. (5.) (*b*). In antagonism to this view, the New School theology of New England has departed to the opposite extreme of rejecting imputation under any form. (See No. 6.)

(5.) The *federal* theory of a vicarious representation of mankind by Adam, in virtue of a covenant made with him. It arose in Holland in the seventeenth century, simultaneously with the development of representative federal government, and gained advocates among Calvinistic or Presbyterian divines in France, England, Scotland, and the United States. It supposes a (one-sided, μονόπλευρον) contract or covenant of the sovereign Creator with the first man, called the covenant of *works* (*fœdus operum*, *fœdus naturæ*), as distinct from the covenant of *grace* (*fœdus gratiæ*), to the effect that Adam should stand a moral probation on behalf of all his descendants, so that his act of obedience or disobedience, with all its consequences, should be judicially imputed to them, or accounted theirs in law. Adam's position is compared to the relation of a representative to his constituents, or rather of a guardian to his wards, since in this case the wards were not consulted, and did not even exist at the time of his appointment. The transaction must be resolved at last into the sovereign pleasure of God.*

Here again we must distinguish two schools:

(*a.*) The *Augustino-federal* school is a combination, and superadds the federal scheme on the realistic basis of participation, so that imputation is made to rest on moral as well as legal grounds. This was the view of the founders and chief advocates of the federal theory, Cocceius (originally John Koch, or Cook, born at Bremen, 1603, died as professor at Leyden, 1669), Burmann, Witsius, and is taught by the Westminster standards,† and even in the *Consensus Helveticus*, although in this the Augustinian idea of participation is almost absorbed by the idea of the covenant.‡

(*b.*) The *purely federal* school (from nominalistic premises, according to which the general conceptions are mere names, not things, subjective abstractions, not objective realities) denies the Adamic unity of the race in the realistic sense, consequently also all participation of Adam's descendants in the

us by gratuitous imputation (*gratuitam justitiæ imputationem*). Ebrard (*Dogmatik*, i., p. 512 f.) and Hodge (on *Romans*, p. 234) represent Calvin as a *mediate* imputationist; the former assenting, the latter dissenting. Calvin and the Reformed Confessions draw no line of demarcation between original sin imputed and original sin inherent. Calvin always guards against the supposition that we are condemned by an arbitrary imputation of a foreign act personal to Adam.]

* [Ebrard says, l. c. i. p. 513: "Bullinger knows of such a *reatus* only which takes place in consequence of the *corruptio* or *vitiositas*, but not of a *reatus* which is the *cause* of the innate *vitiositas*. This would be likewise mediate imputation only. But compare the passages of Bullinger quoted by Rivet, l. c.]

† [The aim of Edwards, in his treatise on Original Sin, written against the Arminian, Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich, was to show that it is no absurd or impossible thing for "the race of mankind truly to partake of the *sin* of the first apostasy, so that this, in reality and propriety, shall become *their* sin; and therefore the sin of the apostasy is not theirs merely because God imputes it to them, but it is truly and properly theirs (by virtue of a real union between the root and the branches of mankind, established by the Author of the universe), and on that *ground* God imputes it to them" (*Works*, ii. p. 559). He says, moreover, that the arguments which prove the depravity of nature, establish also the imputation of Adam's first sin, and that both are included in the usual conception of original sin. "The first depravity of heart, and the imputation of that sin [of Adam], are both the consequences of that established union [between Adam and his posterity]; but yet in such order, that the evil disposition is *first*, and the charge of guilt *consequent*, as it was in the case of Adam himself" (p. 544). Then, in a foot-note, he quotes with approbation a long extract from Stapfer's *Theologia Polemica*, to the effect that the mediate and the immediate imputation are inseparable, and that one should never be considered without the other. Dr. Shedd, *History of Christian Doctrine*, ii. p. 163, seems to hold the same view. Edwards speaks, however, of imputation only incidentally; his main object was to defend the doctrine of native depravity by the theory of identity; *i. e.*, a divinely constituted oneness of Adam and his race, by which his posterity should be born in his moral image, whether good or bad, according to the law that like begets like.]

‡ [The Lutherans held that the *imputatio* is IMMEDIATA: *in quantum exstitimus adhuc in Adamo* (*quia Adam repræsentative fuit totum genus humanum*); MEDIATA: *mediante peccato originali inhærente, in quantum in propriis personis et individualiter consideramur.* The first is mediated through the second. Comp. Luthardt, *Compendium der Dogmatik*, p. 114 (2d ed. 1866).]

* [See the different definitions of this *fœdus operum* from the writings of Cocceius, Witsius, Heidegger, &c., in Heppe's *Dogmatik*, pp. 204 ff. It is called *fœdus* μονόπλευρον, *quia unius tantum partis dispositione et promissione constat*, as distinct from a *fœdus mutuum* or δίπλευρον. There is no Scripture proof whatever for such a primal covenant. The solitary passage quoted, Hosea vi. 7: "For they" (Ephraim and Judah) "like men" (not, "like Adam") "have transgressed the covenant," refers to the Mosaic covenant. Even Turretin (*Inst. theol. elenchticæ*, Pars I. p. 519, of the Edinb. and N. Y. ed., 1847) admits that it is inconclusive, and may be explained of the inconstancy of men, "*ut dicantur transgressi fœdus sicut homines facere solent, qui sua natura vani, levesque sunt et fidem sæpe fallunt.*"]

† [On the Westminster divines, see Baird, *Elohim Revealed*, pp. 39 ff., and especially the learned articles of Dr. Landis in the *Danville Review* for 1861–62.]

‡ [Art. X.: "*Sicut Deus fœdus operum cum Adamo inivit non tantum pro ipso, sed etiam in ipso, ut* CAPITE *et* STIRPE, *cum toto genere humano, . . . ita Adamus tristi prolapsu, non sibi duntaxat sed toti etiam humano generi, . . . bona in fœdere promissa perdidit.*" Comp. also the passages quoted by Heppe, l. c. pp. 228 f.]

act of the primal apostasy; yet it holds that, by virtue of his federal headship on the ground of a sovereign arrangement, his sin and guilt are justly, directly, and immediately imputed to them. The imputation of Adam's sin, and in the same way also the imputation of Christ's righteousness or justification, is thus made a purely forensic process, which affects our legal relation, but by no means our moral character.

This forensic theory of imputation, which excludes participation in Adam's sin, dates from the time of Turretin, in the latter part of the seventeenth century,* and is upheld by a number of Calvinistic divines in England and America, but has no advocate of note, as far as I know, among modern Continental divines.†

Legal representation seemed to offer an easier vindication of Divine justice than the Augustinian view.* It involves, undoubtedly, an element of truth, but, if detached from the idea of moral participation, it resolves itself into a mere legal fiction, and greatly enhances the difficulty of the problem by removing the best reason for imputation. For how can an infinitely just and holy God punish countless millions of human beings simply and solely for the sin of another, in which they had no part whatever? The passage, Ezek. xviii. 1–4, where God rebukes the Israelites for using the proverb of the sour grapes, which Julian of Eclanum and his sympathizers have quoted *ad nauseam* against the Augustinian theory, returns here with double force. The analogy of forensic justification is not to the point, for the righteousness of Christ is not imputed to the impenitent sinner, but only on the subjective condition of faith, by which Christ is apprehended and made our own. Justification presupposes regeneration, or an action of the Holy Spirit, by which He creates repentance of our sins and trust in Jesus Christ, and makes us one with Him. By "being in Christ" is meant, not merely a nominal, putative, or constructive relation, but a real, substantial union; so also our "being in Adam," by which the other relation is illustrated, is real and vital. This analogy, therefore, leads to the opposite conclusion, that moral participation, either potential or personal, or both, must be the ground of the imputation of Adam's sin.

(6.) The New School Calvinists of New England (since the days of the younger Edwards), in radical opposition to Princeton, reject imputation altogether; but maintain that the sinfulness of the descendants of Adam results with *infallible certainty* (though not with *necessity*) from his transgression; the one class holding to hereditary depravity, prior to sinful choice, the other class teaching (with Dr. N. W. Taylor, of New Haven) that the first moral choice of all is universally sinful, yet with the power of contrary choice. This is a peculiar modification of the Pelagian conception of *liberum arbitrium*, but differs from it in making a nice distinction between natural ability and moral inability.†

(7.) The SEMI-PELAGIAN, and the cognate ARMINIAN theories (of which the former, since the fifth century, has gained large influence in the Latin, the latter, since the seventeenth century, in a considerable portion of the Reformed Churches, and was adopted by the Wesleyan Methodists), though by no means explicit and uniform on this point, agree in that they admit the Adamic unity, and the disastrous effects of the primal apostasy upon the whole posterity of Adam, but regard the native or hereditary corruption not properly as sin and guilt exposing us to just punishment, but only as an *evil*, an infirmity, malady, and misfortune, for which the most benevolent God provided a sufficient remedy for all. Zwingli taught a similar view, and distinguished original sin as a moral defect or disease (he called it, in the Swiss dialect, *Bresten*) from sin proper. Semi-Pelagianism holds a medium position between Pelagian-

* [Turretin, like Heidegger, holds indeed to a double unity of the race with Adam, a natural or real, and a federal or forensic, but he evidently lays the chief stress upon the latter, and prepares the way for giving up the former. He says (in his *Institutes*, first published in 1688, Pars I. p. 557, Qu. XI.): "*Adamus duplici vinculo nobiscum junctus est:* (1.) NATURALI, *quatenus pater est, et nos ejus filii*; (2.) POLITICO *ac* FORENSI, *quatenus fuit princeps et caput representativum totius generis humani. Fundamentum ergo imputationis non est tantum communio naturalis, quæ nobis cum Adamo intercedit—alias omnia ipsius peccata deberent nobis imputari—sed* PRÆCIPUE MORALIS *et* FŒDERALIS, *per quam factum est, ut Deus cum illo, ut cum nostro capite, fœdus pepigerit. Unde Adamus se habuit in illo peccato, non ut* PERSONA PRIVATA, *sed ut* PUBLICA *et* REPRESENTATIVA *quæ omnes suos posteros in actione illa repræsentavit, cujus proinde demeritum ad omnes pertinet.*" In Qu. XII. he quotes with approbation from Augustine, "*in illo uno multi unus homo erant,*" adding, by way of explanation, "*unitate non specifica vel numerica, sed partim* UNITATE ORIGINIS, *quia omnes ex uno sunt sanguine, partim* UNITATE REPRÆSENTATIONIS, *quia unus omnium personam repræsentabat, ex ordine Dei.*" In Qu. XVI., pp. 558 f., he establishes his view from Rom. v. 12–14. He says of πάντες ἥμαρτον correctly, that it cannot mean the habit of sin, nor inherent corruption, but actual sin committed in the past (*peccatum aliquod actuale, idque præteritum*), which can be no other than the sin of Adam itself (*quod non potest aliud esse, quam ipsum Adami peccatum*); but then he turns it into the meaning of representative sinning: "*Ergo eo peccante* CENSENTUR *et ipsi peccasse.*" He proves this from the analogy of Christ: "*In Christo justi constituimur per justitiæ imputationem: ergo et peccatores in Adamo per peccati ipsius imputationem.*" This is precisely the exegesis of Dr. Hodge, except that Turretin translates ἐφ' ᾧ, with Augustin, *in quo* (viz., *Adamo*), while Hodge, more correctly, takes it as a conjunction.]

† [Drs. Ridgely, Doddridge, Watts, and Cunningham, of Scotland (in his *Historical Theology*, Edinb., 1863, vol. i., p. 515, and in his *Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation*, Edinb., 1862, pp. 371 ff.), are counted on this side. Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, is the ablest advocate of immediate forensic imputationism. He states it (on *Romans*, p. 279) as follows: "The doctrine of imputation is clearly taught in this passage (Rom. v.). This doctrine does not include the idea of a mysterious identity of Adam and his race, nor that of a transfer of the moral turpitude of his sin to his descendants. It does not teach that his offence was personally or properly the sin of all men, or that his act was, in any mysterious sense, the act of his posterity. Neither does it imply, in reference to the righteousness of Christ, that His righteousness becomes personally and inherently ours, or that His moral excellence is in any way transferred from Him to believers. The sin of Adam, therefore, is no ground to us of remorse; and the righteousness of Christ is no ground of self-complacency in those to whom it is imputed. This doctrine merely teaches that, in virtue of the union, representative and natural, between Adam and his posterity, his sin is the ground of their condemnation—that is, of their subjection to penal evils—and that, in virtue of the union between Christ and His people, His righteousness is the ground of their justification. This doctrine is taught almost in so many words in vers. 12, 15–19. It is so clearly stated, so often repeated or assumed, and so formally proved, that very few commentators of any class fail to acknowledge, in one form or another, that it is the doctrine of the Apostle." The last is a mistake, as we have shown in the *Exeg. Notes*. Dr. Hodge's hostility to the realistic Augustinian view proceeds, I think, from a misunderstanding. He does not distinguish between a virtual or potential, and a personal or individual coëxistence and coägency of the race in Adam. Augustine taught the former only; the latter is impossible and absurd, unless we hold it in the form of preëxistence, which Augustine expressly rejects.]

* [Watts, as quoted by Prof. Fisher, l. c. p. 506, naïvely confesses that he would gladly renounce this theory if he could find any other way to vindicate Providence.]

† [Comp. Stuart and Barnes on Rom. v.; Prof. Geo. P. Fisher, "The *Princeton Review* on the Theology of Dr. N. W. Taylor," in the *New Englander* for April, 1868.]

ism and Augustinianism; Arminianism wavers between semi-Pelagianism and Calvinism; both may, according to the elastic nature of compromises, lean now more to the one, now to the other extreme; employing at times the Augustinian phraseology, but putting, after all, a different interpretation upon it.

The stationary anthropology and hamartiology of the *Greek* Church occupies a similar position, but it never passed through the mill of Western controversies, and remains to this day theologically incomplete.

Most evangelical divines of the present day are divided between the Augustinian or realistic, the federal or forensic, and the Arminian theories, or they look for a still more satisfactory solution of the difficult problem by a future Augustine, who may be able to advance, from a deeper study of the Scriptures, the knowledge of the Church, and reconcile what now seem to be irreconcilable contradictions. It should be remembered that the main difficulty lies in the *fact* itself—the undeniable, stubborn, terrible fact—of the universal dominion of sin and death over the entire race, infants as well as full-grown sinners. No system of philosophy has ever given a more satisfactory explanation than the great divines of the Church. Outside of the Christian redemption, the fall, with its moral desolation and ruin, remains an impenetrable mystery. But immediately after the fall appears, in the promise of the serpent-bruiser, the second Adam, and throws a bright ray of hope into the gloom of despair. In the fulness of the time, according to God's own counsel, He appeared in our nature, to repair the loss, and to replace the temporary reign of sin by the everlasting reign of superabounding grace, which never could have been revealed in all its power without the fall.* The person and work of the second Adam are the one glorious solution of the problem of the first, and the triumphant vindication of Divine justice and mercy. This is the main point for all practical purposes, and in this, at least, all true Christians are agreed.—P. S.]

3. [In Lange, No. 2.] *Criticism of the Augustinian doctrine of Sin and Grace.* Augustine, in his controversy with Pelagius, has undoubtedly expressed and defended the Church's sense of religious truth, and thereby become a rich source of blessing to Western Christendom. It cannot be denied, however, that the theologico-dogmatical expression of his sense of truth—especially his doctrine of original sin—far transcends the Scriptural bounds, and has done harm by its erroneous features. Augustine has not only supported, but also obstructed the Reformation. His explanation of ἐφ' ᾧ in ver. 12, which has obscured the exegesis of this passage even in Meyer (not to speak of Tholuck and Philippi), is of itself a sufficient testimony of this. See the *Exeg. Notes.* It sets aside the *formal* freedom which remains even within the *material* bondage and slavery, and which, under the power of sin, becomes a λαμβάνειν of death by means of unbelief but, under the exercise of the *gratia præveniens*, becomes a λαμβάνειν of the marks of salvation by means of faith. It thus destroys or weakens the ethical signification of the λαμβάνειν itself [comp vers. 11 and 17, and *Notes*] in the interest of the Augustinian dogmatics. The biblical doctrine of original sin is distinguished from the Augustinian mainly in the following respects:

(*a.*) The Bible teaches an ethico-physical fall of the human race from Adam, as a fall *in principle;* Augustine, a physico-ethical fall of the human race in Adam, as a *completed fact.** Therefore Augustine ignores the distinction between the *inheritance* of the propensity and curse of sin, or of death—which inheritance oppresses all who are Adamically begotten—and the ethical *appropriation* of the corruption.

(*b.*) With Augustine, the ideal and *potential* condition of condemnation—that is, the *condemnableness* of men, apart from redemption—coincides with a judicially *completed* condition of *condemnation;* therefore, with him, redemption is properly a new creation.

(*c.*) With Augustine, the exercise of grace, of the Logos, and of the Spirit of God, is theocratically and ecclesiastically bound and limited; his Christ is, in substance, not greater than the extent (*rayon*) of the Church; therefore he does not perceive the *gradations* of the hereditary blessing and of the hereditary curse within the general corruption of mankind. and still less the significance of the antithesis in chap. ii. 14, 15, within the whole world. His acceptation of mere gradations of evil downwardly, is in contradiction with his own system.

(*d.*) A consequence of this extreme view of original sin is his extreme view of the government of *grace.* He had in mind, probably, the great religious truth of the *ethical* irresistibility of all-conquering love; but in his theological system he gave it a *fatalistic* character in opposition to formal freedom.

(*e.*) Because, with him, the ideal and potential condemnation of all is aggravated into an actual condition of condemnation, he has also—in consequence of the fact that only a part of humanity within the ecclesiastical pale of this world believe and are saved—limited the extent of the effects of the ideal and potential δικαίωμα, or righteous act of Christ; while Paul teaches that the δικαίωμα has come εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς upon all men.

[There is considerable force in these objections to the Augustinian system which apply *à fortiori* to Calvinism. But they cannot diminish the great merits of the African father, who searched the problem of sin more profoundly than any divine before or after him. He was right in teaching the (virtual or potential) fall of the whole race in Adam, and the sinfulness of our *nature*, or depraved *will*, as the source of all sinful volitions, words, and acts. But he did not take into sufficient account that there is a Divine πάρεσις and ἀνοχή, which hold the arm of God's ὀργή, and suspend the *full* and *final* execution of the well-deserved judgment, until men make the fall of Adam their personal, individual act and reject the offer of redemption (comp. the remarks on Rom. iii. 24, 25, p. 134). Hence Augus

* [This idea has found familiar expression in devotional lines such as those of Watts:

"In Christ the tribes of Adam boast
More blessings than their father lost."

Bishop Ken (*Christian Year*, Sunday next before Easter):

"What Adam did amiss,
Turned to our endless bliss;
O happy sin, which to atone,
Drew Filial God to leave his Throne!"

A. L. Hillhouse:

"Earth has a joy unknown in heaven—
The new-born peace of sin forgiven!
Tears of such pure and deep delight,
Ye angels! never dimmed your sight."]

* [Comp., however, my remarks on pp. 178 and 192.]

tine consigns even all unbaptized children to condemnation, although in the mildest form (*De pecc. orig.*, c. 36: "*Infans perditione punitur, quia pertinet ad massam perditionis.*" *Enchir.*, c. 93: "*Mitissima sane omnium pœna erit eorum, qui præter peccatum quod originale traxerunt, nullum insuper addiderunt.*") In this respect even the strictest Calvinistic divines of our age decidedly dissent from him, and are disposed to hold that all children who die in infancy, whether baptized or not, will be saved by the infinite mercy of God. This charitable belief and hope has a strong support in the universal sufficiency of the atonement, and especially in the words of our Saviour concerning little children, spoken without qualification or limitation (Matt. xix. 14; Mark x. 14). There can be no salvation without Christ, even for children; but God is not bound to the use of His own appointed means, by which the benefits of Christ are ordinarily applied to men.—P. S.]

4. On the question why *Eve* is not the one human being by whom sin came into the world (Pelagius and Ambrosiaster have really held that Eve is meant),* compare, in addition to the *Exeg. Notes*, Tholuck, p. 216.

5. The Apostle does not speak here of the *first origin of sin*, or of the fall of Satan, as Christ does, John viii. 44. Although the doctrine of the devil is by no means wanting in his writings, it does not stand out very prominently. He here speaks merely of the entrance of sin into our *human* world from an unknown world beyond this, where it is assumed that it already existed in personified form. Now, this human world is neither the whole universe, nor merely human nature, but the human race in connection with the earth and the cosmic nature as far as it is organically connected with man (see 2 Peter iii. 10, and other passages). The personification of sin and of death exhibits both as (pseudo-formative) principles which have pervaded the organism of the human world, but under the ethical conditions under which they can alone become thoroughly dominant. The individual man, in his organic nature, is connected with humanity, but as an individual intellectual being he has an existence in himself. Pelagius denied the former, while Augustine has largely ignored the latter. The organic connection implies the propagation of the sinful propensity and guilt, according to John iii. 6, as well as according to chaps. vi.–viii. of this Epistle. In the broader sense, Christ also stood in the organic connection of humanity as the Son of Man, but only in the historical sense. Therefore He bore the burden of humanity for its reconciliation.

6. Paul calls the sin of Adam παράβασις, as the *transgression* of the Divine commandment standing clearly before him; παράπτωμα, as the sin which resulted in a *fall;* ἁμάρτημα, as a *starting-point* of many sins; παρακοή, as *disobedience* to the known will of God. These designations and statements set aside such theories on the origin of sin as that of J. Müller (that there was a previous or timeless fall of the human souls), and that of R. Rothe (that sin was the original, abnormal condition of humanity proceeding from their material constitution).

7. The relation of *sin to death*. Sin *is* death, says John (1 John iii. 14, 15); sin *bringeth forth* death, says James (chap. i. 15); sin has, as its wages or punishment, death as a consequence, says Paul (Rom. vi. 23). This is all the same relation, but from different points of view. The physical dying of the creature in itself is not thereby meant, but the perishableness of the creature is increased by ethical or spiritual death (Rom. viii.); and the original transformation destined for man (2 Cor. v. 1 ff.) has, by sin, become fearful death, in connection with corruption and the gloom of Sheol. Therefore Death itself is conquered by the death of Christ, because its sting is taken from it (1 Cor. xv. 51, 56). The ethical character of death and the salvation of the redeemed from death are brought to light not only in the resurrection, but also in the revelation of the original transformation at the end of the world (1 Cor. xv. 51); while the ungodly, in spite of the general resurrection, are subject to the second death (Rev. ii. 11; xx. 6, &c.).

8. In the period between Adam and Moses, death appeared to be merely the order of nature, because the paradisaical law had disappeared from knowledge by the fall, and the Mosaic law had not yet appeared. Nevertheless, sin was also at that time the causality of death, but not as transgression in the light of legal knowledge. The concealed sin against the law dwelling in all men (chap. ii. 14, 15) was, indeed, attested by the manifest, tyrannical, and terrible dominion of death. Sin, says Paul, is not imputed where there is no law—that is, not fully settled until the law. But since it is with the gospel that the full significance of the law becomes clear, it follows that condemnation can only come with final hardening of the heart against the gospel.

9. *Adam* and *Christ* appear here as principles of the old and new humanity, of the first and second æon, so far as their posterity is determined by their life. Yet it is not Adam in himself who is the principle of sin and death, but Adam in his deed—his disobedience. From the nature of sin, the disobedience (παρακοή) cannot coincide in him with personality. In Christ, on the contrary, personality and the obedience (ὑπακοή) are one. In reference to personal issue, Adam is the natural ancestor of the whole human race. Christ is the spiritual founder of the whole human race. Both constitute together a harmonious antithesis in historical consequence (1 Cor. xv. 45). But they represent the principal antithesis in so far as sin and death proceeded from one (through him), and righteousness and life from the other. The Apostle sets forth these antitheses in a series of parallels, in which, first, their homogeneousness comes into consideration (the *through one*, the organic development), and second, the dissimilarity (the *much more* on Christ's part); then the removal of sin by grace, and the triumph of the new principle (so far as by means of the law it makes sin itself serviceable to its glory). On the construction of these antitheses, compare the general groundwork of the *Exeg. Notes*.

10. While doctrinal theology has ascribed to the *law* a threefold use or purpose (bar or bridle, mirror, rule—*Zügel*, *Spiegel*, *Regel*), the Apostle seems here to add a *usus quartus*, or rather *primus*, in so far as he says that the law must have brought sin to full manifestation and development. This thought is not altogether included in the use of the mirror (see the *Exeg. Notes*), but it is most intimately connected with it. As the knowledge of sin must come by the law, so also *the revelation, the bringing of sin to*

* [Pelagius, in his superficial commentary on *Romans*, preserved in the works of Jerome and Augustine, explains δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου: "*per unum hominem Evam.*"—P. S.]

light, must come by the law. The law has not produced real inward sin, but, like a chemical element, it has introduced a fermenting process into humanity, in which human nature and sinfulness seem to be identical; and by this means the external manifestation of sin is finished, in order to render possible its distinction and separation from human nature itself. The holiness of this effect is properly understood when we distinguish properly between the inward sin and its outward realization, its phase, in which the judgment has already commenced. Hence it is clear that the use of the law is the effecting of the knowledge of sin. The manifestation of sin for bringing to pass the *knowledge* of sin, comes by the law. The law, *as letter*, has completed the *development* of sin; the law, as the *word of the Spirit*, has brought the perfect *knowledge* of sin.

11. Although Paul, in this section, has mostly contrasted *the many* on the one side with *the many* on the other—because this expression makes more apparent the grandeur of the fundamental developments from the one—he yet declares definitely, in ver. 18, that the δικαίωμα of the one Christ is available for all men, with the tendency to become for them the δικαίωσις ζωῆς.

12. The Apostle makes prominent in many ways the great *preponderance* of the antitheses of *grace* over the theses of sin. The author of sin becomes to him a nameless being, who is opposed by God in His grace, and by the man Jesus Christ as the personal gift of grace. Sin itself falls immediately into the κρῖμα, and meets the κατάκριμα. But the work of grace breaks through many offences, as if invited and augmented by them, like a mountain stream from the rocky cliff; and the dominion of death on one side is only a measure of the much more powerful revelation of grace on the other. But the so-called ἀποκατάστασις, as a necessary, natural result of salvation, is no more declared in the πάντες of ver. 15, than the expression οἱ πολλοί is designed to abridge the universality of grace. The ethical part of the organized process, the λαμβάνειν on one or the other side, is opposed to such a conclusion. Nevertheless, it is the Apostle's aim to glorify the unfathomableness, immeasurableness, and illimitableness of the stream of grace, and its absolute and universal triumph in the history of the world.

["Sin reigns in death, grace reigns unto life." On this, Dr. Hodge remarks (p. 279): "That the benefits of redemption shall far outweigh the evils of the fall, is here clearly asserted. This we can in a measure comprehend, because, (1.) The number of the saved shall doubtless greatly exceed the number of the lost. Since the half of mankind die in infancy, and, according to the Protestant doctrine, are heirs of salvation; and since, in the future state of the Church, the knowledge of the Lord is to cover the earth, we have reason to believe that the lost shall bear to the saved no greater proportion than the inmates of a prison do to the mass of the community. (2.) Because the eternal Son of God, by His incarnation and mediation, exalts His people to a far higher state of being than our race, if unfallen, could ever have attained. (3.) Because the benefits of redemption are not to be confined to the human race. Christ is to be admired in His saints. It is through the Church that the manifold wisdom of God is to be revealed, throughout all ages, to principalities and powers. The redemption of man is to be the great source of knowledge and blessedness to the intelligent universe."—I add a fine passage from Dr. Richard Clerke (Sermon on Titus ii 11, quoted by Ford): "Grace will not be confined. For God's goodness cannot be exhausted. He is *dives in omnes*, saith the Apostle, rich enough for all (x. 12). It is an excellent attribute, which is given him by St. James, πολυεύσπλαγχνος [in some MSS., but the usual reading in James v. 11 is πολύσπλαγχνος.—P. S.] In God's mercy, there is both εὖ and πολύ: it is both free and rich; both *gratiosa et copiosa* (Ps. cxxx.), both bountiful and plentiful: not only περισσεύουσα, bursting forth round about, round about all ages, round about all nations, round about all sorts, but ὑπερπερισσεύουσα (ver. 20), surrounding all those rounds, and with surplus and advantage overflowing all. I say, not only πλεονάζουσα, an abounding grace, abounding unto all, to the whole world, but ὑπερπλεονάζουσα (1 Tim. i. 14), a grace superabounding; that, if there were more worlds, grace would 'bring salvation' even unto them all. St. Paul's own parallel shall end this point (1 Tim. ii. 4). It is God's will that 'all men should be saved.'"—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

What follows from the comparison of Adam with Christ? 1. That by the *one* Adam, sin, death, condemnation, and the dominion of death have come; 2. But by the *one* Christ, life, righteousness, and the dominion of grace have come upon all men (vers. 12–21).—Sin and death passed upon *all* (vers. 12–14).—Sin as the cause of death: 1. Original sin; 2. Sins of commission (ver. 12).—They too have sinned who have not committed the same transgression as Adam; comp. chap. ii. 12 (ver. 14).—All sin is transgression of the law, but not in the same way (ver. 14).—Adam is a figure of Him that was to come (ver. 14).—Man a figure of the Son of Man (ver. 14).—The first and second Adam: 1. Resemblance; 2. Difference (vers. 14–19).—The difference between sin and gift. It consists herein: 1. That, through the sin of one, many have died, but that, on the other hand, God's grace and gift have freely abounded unto many; 2. By one man's sin many have become condemned, but one gift has abounded from many offences to righteousness; 3. By the sin of the one, death has reigned over many, but by the one Jesus Christ will many still more rejoice in the dominion of life (vers. 15–17).—The *sole* man Jesus Christ; not only (1.) one, but also (2.) the only one of His character (ver. 15).—Yet how different are the fruits of sin and righteousness! 1. The fruit of the former is condemnation; 2. The fruit of the latter is justification of life (ver. 18).—As condemnation is come unto all men, so also is justification of life (ver. 18).—The universality of Divine grace brought to pass by the righteousness of Christ (ver. 18).—The different effects of Adam's disobedience and Christ's obedience (ver. 19).—For what purpose did the law enter? 1. Not merely to make sin prominent; but, 2. To bring it to a crisis; and so, 3. To prepare for grace by Jesus Christ our Lord (vers. 20, 21).

LUTHER: As Adam has corrupted us with foreign sin without our fault, so has Christ saved us with foreign grace without our merit (ver. 14).—Notice that he speaks here of original sin, which has come from Adam's disobedience; therefore every thing is sinful which pertains to us (ver. 18).—As Adam's

sin has become our own, so has Christ's righteousness become our own (ver. 19).

BENGEL: God's gift is grace, flowing from the Father upon Him, and through Him to us.

STARKE: Believers are, by the spiritual life of the new birth, reigning kings over sin on earth, as they shall also be fellow-kings in the heaven of glory (ver. 17).—O universal grace of God, by which all may be saved by Christ! 1 Tim. ii. 4; Acts xvii. 30, 31 (ver. 18).—A small drop of grace can calm and engulf the raging waves of corruption (ver. 20).—CRAMER: As no one can deny that he is mortal, so also must no one say that he is not sinful (ver. 14).—*Nova Bibl. Tüb.*: Sin has a mighty kingdom and dominion. Let nobody regard it as small and contemptible! Yet the kingdom of grace is much more mighty. The purpose of the latter is to destroy the former; where the kingdom of grace increases, the kingdom of sin declines. The former brings life, the latter death.

GERLACH: There is this great difference between the effects of the fall and of redemption: the effects of the former consist in a strongly legal judgment, which must ensure condemnation in consequence of a single transgression; but the effects of the latter are a free gift, which made amends not merely for one sin, but for all the repetitions of Adam's transgression that have arisen from that first one; and it has made amends so completely, that it has really effected in fallen men the righteousness required by the law (ver. 16).—So powerfully does grace operate on those who have received its fulness, that they, by grace, become rulers in life through Jesus Christ (ver. 17).

LISCO: Mankind is united in Adam and Christ; therefore the sin of Adam became the sin of all, and Christ's offering became the propitiation for all. As every leaf of the tree *suffers* by disease of the root, so does every one *recover* by its restoration; thus it is with mankind in Adam and Christ (vers. 12–21).—Death is the great evil that was begotten by sin (ver. 12).—As Adam's sin has become ours, so has Christ's righteousness become ours (ver. 19).

RIEGER: This little passage is as the pillar of fire in the wilderness; dark and threatening toward the Egyptians and impenitent, but bright and clear toward the Israelites. This passage lightens and thunders against hard sinners, who treat every thing lightly; but it shines with the lovely splendor of grace upon penitent and anxious souls (ver. 20).

HEUBNER: The dominion of sin in the world is not God's work, but man's guilt.—The universality of corruption should not comfort, but humiliate us: 1. We should each be ashamed before all the rest; 2. We should be ashamed before the inhabitants of other worlds, who perhaps do not know any thing about sin; 3. We should so much the more bear in mind, that, amid the universal sinfulness, we shall not be the only pure ones; 4. We must therefore work out our salvation the more earnestly by prayer, and faith in Christ (ver. 12).—Adam is the natural, Christ is the spiritual ancestor; the former is the transgressor of the Divine commandment, the latter the fulfiller of the whole Divine law; the former is the cause of death and human corruption, the latter the author of life, redemption, and holiness (ver. 14).—The real ground why the operation of Divine grace is as universal as the sinful corruption from Adam, is this: that *grace* knows no other limits than those which man himself sets by unbelief (ver. 17).—The more man is pervaded by the knowledge of his sin, the richer will be his reception of grace (Luke vii. 47).

BESSER: By one upon all (vers. 12–21).—The saving counsel of God has always been one and the same to all men, not only to the children of Abraham, but to all the sons of Adam (ver. 12).—Death, having once stepped its foot into the world, has forced its way to all men (ver. 12).—Sin has become a natural power over persons, which cannot be dislodged by the blows of any club; but grace—which does not enter with compulsory power, but with the evangelical drawing of the word of God—is so powerful that it breaks the power of nature (ver. 12).—*Death reigned.* Well for us that this is said as of a ruler who is dead (ver. 17).—The new decree, "You shall live," which is warranted by the empty grave of Jesus Christ, is higher and stronger than the old decree, "You must die," which is confirmed by millions of graves (ver. 17).—The Apostle once more recapitulates the abundance of doctrine which he has demonstrated all along from ver. 12: *Sin, death, grace, righteousness, life.* These five stand thus: grace rises highest in the middle; the two conquering giants, Sin and Death, at the left; the double prize of victory, Righteousness and Life, at the right; and over the buried name of Adam the glory of the name of Jesus blooms (ver. 21).

SCHLEIERMACHER, on ver. 19: The effects of the death of the Redeemer, so far as it was a work of His obedience.—DEICHERT: Has the Christ who died for us become the Christ within us?—How much more blessed to live under grace than under the law!

LANGE: Adam and Christ in the internal and historical life of mankind.—As all men are comprehended in the fall of Adam, so, and still more, are they in the righteousness of Christ.—As sin and death have assumed the appearance of personal, princely powers, in order to extinguish the personal life of mankind, so does the personal God again elevate men, by the glorious personality of Christ, to a personal life in royal freedom.—The antithesis between Adam and Christ: 1. In personal effects (ver. 15); 2. In essential effects (ver. 16); 3. In the destruction of the apparently personal life of sin, and the restoration and glorification of the true personal life of grace, or the false and the true βασιλεύειν (ver. 17); 4. In the final aims of both (ver. 18); 5. In the full manifestation of both in the light of the gospel (ver. 19).—The glory of God's grace in the exercise of its authority. How it has not only, 1. Conquered sin and death; but, 2. Even made them of service.—The Divine art of distinguishing the effect of the law.—The twofold character of the law: 1. Apparently a promotion of sin; but, 2. Really a communication of grace.—Adam, Moses, and Christ.—How far does Moses appear to stand on Adam's side; but how far does he rather stand on Christ's side?—The twofold effect of the law and of legality in the history of the world.—The twofold curse of the law: 1. The curse of the law, well understood, leads to salvation; 2. The curse of the law, misunderstood, leads to ruin.

[BURKITT (condensed): Every sin we commit in defiance of the threatenings of God is a justifying of Adam's rebellion against God. Our destruction is in ourselves, by our actual rebellion; and at the great day we shall charge our sin and misery upon ourselves—not on God, not on Satan, not on instruments, and not on our first parents.—HENRY: We are by Christ and His righteousness entitled to, and

instated in, more and greater privileges than we lost by the offence of Adam. The plaster is wider than the wound, and more healing than the wound is killing.—SCOTT: Instead of perplexing ourselves about the incomprehensible but most righteous dispensation of God, in permitting the entrance of sin and death, let us learn to adore His grace for providing so adequate a remedy for that awful catastrophe.—As our children have received a sinful and suffering nature from the first Adam, let us be stirred up by their pains and sorrows to seek for them the blessings of the second Adam's righteousness and salvation.—WESLEY (Sermon on *God's Love to Fallen Man*, Rom. v. 15): The more we deal our bread to the hungry and cover the naked with garments, and the more kind offices we do to those that groan under the various ills of human life, the more comfort we receive even in the present world, and the greater the recompense we have in our own bosom.—DWIGHT: The subject of moral evil is too extensive and mysterious to be comprehended by our understanding. Many things connected with it lie wholly beyond our reach. But where knowledge is unattainable, it is our duty and interest to trust humbly and submissively to the instructions of Him who is the *Only Wise*.—CLARKE: The grace of the gospel not only redeems from death and restores to life, but brings the soul into such a relationship with God, and into such a participation of eternal glory, as we have no authority to believe would have been the portion of Adam himself, had he even eternally retained his innocence.—HODGE: We should never yield to temptation on the ground that the sin to which we are solicited appears to be a trifle (merely eating a forbidden fruit), or that it is but for once. Remember the one offence of one man. How often has a man, or a family, been ruined forever by one sin!—Compare Isaac de la Peyrere's *Men before Adam* (London, 1656), in which the author attempts to prove that the first men were created before Adam, and builds up a curious theological system on that supposition.—Compare also W. BUCKLAND's *Inquiry whether the Sentence of Death pronounced at the Fall of Man included the Whole Animal Creation, or was restricted to the Human Race.* London, 1839.—J. F. H.]

PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF CHAPTERS VI.–VIII.

After the Apostle has exhibited the antithesis of Adam and Christ in its principal or fundamental form and significance, chap. v. 12–21, he passes on to exhibit the same antithesis in all its consequences, first of all for believers, but then also for the whole world.

The *negative* side of this consequence is exhibited in chaps. vi. and vii.: The dying with Christ to sin and to the entire old form of life.

The *positive* side is exhibited in chap. viii.: The new life in Christ.

I. The first division is again divided into four parts.

A. As Christians have fundamentally (objectively by the death of Christ himself, and subjectively through the faith sealed by baptism) died with Christ to sin in order to walk in newness of life, so should they act as those who are dead to sin. For their new life is an organic connection with Christ, an organic development; yet it is not a life subject to fatalistic natural necessity, but, in conformity with fellowship with Christ, it is a life in true freedom, as life after Adam has been one in false freedom, or the seeming freedom of hard service. It is a religiously or ethically organic relation; chap. vi. 1–11.

B. Because believers are dead to sin, they are free from its dominion. They should therefore take knowledge of the fact that they are delivered, and keep themselves from the *bondage* of sin; and in the power of their freedom, they should yield themselves under grace to be the servants of righteousness; chap. vi. 12–23.

C. But their being dead to sin means also that they, as those who passed into newness of life, have received in themselves the new principle of life, which is righteousness, or the inward substance of the law. Therefore, by Christ, they are dead to the law in the narrower sense, in which they lived in matrimonial alliance. They should serve, not in outward ordinances, but inward principle—from the force of grace, the impulse of the heart; chap. vii. 1–6.

D. But if *to be dead to sin* means also *to be dead to the law*, as well as the reverse, there follows nothing therefrom contrary to the *holiness* of the law. The law, rather, was designed, by its constant operation in awakening and increasing the conflict with sin, to effect the transition from the state of sin to the state of grace; chap. vii. 7–25.

II. The second or positive part is thus prepared. The condition of believers is free from all condemnation, because, in harmony with its character, it is a life in the Spirit of Christ. But it is a life in the Spirit which is prepared by the Spirit through the glorification of the body and the whole nature; for the Spirit, as the Spirit of adoption, is the first security for it, and the believer is certain of it beforehand in blessed hope; chap. viii.

A. This life in the Spirit now demands, first of all, the laying off, in the conduct of the Christian, of all carnal lusts, which must, however, be distinguished from a positively ascetic mortification of the body; chap. viii. 1–10.

B. As the Spirit of God testifies to adoption, so does it, as the Spirit of the risen Christ, secure the inheritance—that is, the renewal of the body, and the glorification of life; vers. 11–17. The certainty of this blessed hope is established: *a.* On the development of life in this world, vers. 18–30; *b.* On the future or heavenly administration of the love of God and the grace of Christ, which make all the forces that apparently conflict with salvation even serviceable to its realization; vers. 31–39.

Meyer's inscription over chaps. vi.–viii. is: "Ethical Effects of the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. Chap. vi. 7 shows that the δικ., far from giving aid to immorality, is the first to exclude it, and to promote, restore, and vitalize virtue; and chap. viii. exhibits the blessed condition of those who, being justified, are morally free." Tholuck: "It has been shown down to this point how much the Christian has received by that δικ. πιστ.; chap. i. 17. It is the mention of the fulness of grace called forth by the

power of sin, that now leads the Apostle to exhibit the moral consequences of this communication of grace, which in turn leads him further (chap. vii). to the statement of the insufficiency of the legal economy; and in antithesis thereto (chap. viii.), to the moral effects of the economy of grace and its saving issue; so that the Apostle, after amplifying and enriching the explanations between chap. i. 18 and chap. v., returns to the same point with which chap. v. concluded." The Apostle does, indeed, return to the same point with which, not the whole of chap. v. concluded, but with which chap v. 11. concluded, but in a sense altogether different, inasmuch as from chap. v. 12 on, the Apostle brings out, not merely the *actual* antagonism of sin and grace in humanity, as before, but the *principial* antagonism of the two principles in its ethical and organic aspect.

Second Section.—*The contradiction between sin and grace. The calling of Christians to newness of life, since they were translated by baptism into the death of Christ from the sphere of sin and death into the sphere of the new life.*

Chap. VI. 1–11.

1 What shall we say then? Shall [May][1] we continue in sin, that grace may
2 abound? God forbid [Let it not be!].[2] How shall we, that are dead [who died]
3 to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as [all we
who][3] were baptized into Jesus Christ [Christ Jesus][4] were baptized into his
4 death? Therefore we are [were] buried with him by [through] baptism into
death: that [in order that] like [*omit* like] as Christ was raised up from the
dead by [through] the glory of the Father, even [*omit* even] so we also should
5 walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in [become
united[5] with][6] the likeness of his death, we shall be also *in* [*with*] *the likeness*
6 of *his* resurrection: Knowing this, that our old man is [was] crucified with
him, that [in order that][7] the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth
7 we should not serve [be slaves to][8] sin. For he that is dead [hath died][9] is
8 freed [acquitted] from sin. Now if we be dead [died] with Christ, we believe
9 that we shall also live with him:[10] Knowing that Christ being raised from
the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him [dominion over
10 him no more]. For in that [*or, the death* that][11] he died, he died unto sin once
11 [for all]: but in that [*or, the life* that] he liveth, he liveth unto God. Like-
wise [Thus] reckon ye also yourselves to be [*omit* to be][12] dead indeed unto sin,
but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord [ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, in Christ
Jesus. *Omit* our Lord].[13]

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 1.—[The reading of the *Rec.* (ἐπιμενοῦμεν) is poorly supported. A. B. C. D. F. read ἐπιμένωμεν; adopted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth. The above emendation is supported by the last two editors. ℵ. K., and some cursives, have ἐπιμένομεν.

[2] Ver. 2.—[Μὴ γένοιτο is a very forcible negative. How it should be rendered, is perhaps a matter of taste, but the *God forbid* expresses its forcibleness as no other English phrase can. Comp. *Galatians*, ii. 17; p. 49, note.

[3] Ver. 3.—[The E. V. is literally correct, but the reference seems to be to those baptized as a whole (Meyer); hence the emendation, which is adopted by Alford, Wordsworth, Amer. Bible Union.

[4] Ver. 3.—[B., and a number of cursives and fathers, omit Ἰησοῦν. The order in almost all authorities is Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν.

[5] Ver. 5.—[Wordsworth renders σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν: *have become connate with*. This is literal and exact, but *connate* would scarcely be proper in a popular version. Meyer, Lange: "*zusammengewachsen, grown together*. *United* (Alford, Amer. Bible Union) is adopted in lieu of a better word. The E. V.: *planted together*, is based on a wrong view of the etymology of σύμφυτοι.

[6] Ver. 5.—[*In* of the E. V. is not found in the Greek. *With*, in both clauses, is borrowed from σύμφυτοι. Any further emendation must be based on exegetical views of the verse.

[7] Ver. 6.—[Ἵνα, telic, *in order that*. The next clause is telic also; but as a different form is chosen in Greek, it is better to let the simple *that* remain. Amer. Bible Union reverses the position of *in order that, that*, leaving it indefinite whether the first clause is telic.

[8] Ver. 6.—[The verb δουλεύειν means, first, to be a servant, or slave, then, to serve. The personification of sin, implied in this passage, makes the primary meaning more correct here, and *slaves* is preferable to *servants*, for obvious reasons.

[9] Ver. 7.—[This verse has an aorist (ἀποθανών) in the first part, and a perfect (δεδικαίωται) in the second. Yet the rendering: *He that died has been justified from sin* (Amer. Bible Union) does not convey its meaning properly. The aorist refers to something antecedent to the perfect, while the perfect states what continues to be true; hence, in English, we must invert, rendering the aorist by *has died*, the perfect by *is acquitted*. The Apostle is stating a general proposition, which is not theological, but legal; hence, *acquitted* is preferable to *justified*.

[10] Ver. 8.—[The reading συνζήσομεν is found in ℵ. B[1]. D. F., and is now generally adopted. *Rec.*: συζήσομεν found in B[2]. L. C. K., have συζήσωμεν; which Lange considers a legal correction to the hortatory. F. has συνζήσωμεθα.

[10] Ver. 10.—[The grammatical question respecting ὅ is indicated by the two renderings given in each member of this verse. The meaning is essentially the same, whichever be adopted (Meyer).

[11] Ver. 11.—[Rec., ℵ[3]. K. L., insert εἶναι after νεκροὺς μέν, ℵ[1]. B. C., before; it is omitted in A. D. E. F. G., by most modern editors.

[12] Ver. 11.—[The E. V. is unfortunate in rendering ἐν, *through*, since the point of the whole passage is, that we are alive in virtue of our union to Christ—*i. e.*, *in Christ Jesus*. The *Rec.* adds τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, on the authority of . C. K. L., some versions and fathers. The words are omitted in A. B. D. F., most versions, by many fathers. Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The section chap. vi. 1–11. Survey The death of Christians to sin, and their new life.

a. The effect and demand of grace: death and life, vers. 1, 2.

b. According to baptism, vers. 3, 4.

c. According to the connection with Christ in His death and resurrection, vers. 5, 6.

d. According to the power and import of death, especially as a dying with Christ, vers. 7, 8.

e. According to the power of the new life as an incorruptible life with Christ, vers. 9–11.

Ver. 1. **What then shall we say?** The οὖν introduces the true conclusion from the previous verses, chap. v. 20, 21, by repelling the false conclusion which might be deduced from what is said there. [ἐπιμένωμεν, the deliberative subjunctive. See note on ἔχωμεν, p. 160.—P. S.]

Ver. 2. **Let it not be** [μὴ γένοιτο]. See chap. iii. 4, 6 [and *Textual Note* [4], p. 112.—P. S.].

How shall we who died to sin [οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ.] Οἵτινες [describing the *quality*], *as such who*. Living in sin is utterly contradictory to the character of Christians. And the contradiction is very intense, not simply because of the aversion and repulsion between natural death and life referred to by Rungius (see Tholuck).* The Christian is specifically dead to sin; and the *life in sin*, as a *definitely false life*, is opposed to this definite death. We have here an expression, therefore, not merely of "freedom from all life-fellowship with sin" [so Meyer], but also of the positive contradiction and repulsion between sin and Christian life. The reality of this contradiction is decided, figuratively exhibited, and sacramentally sealed by baptism. Yet the Apostle does not simply borrow his expression of it from baptism; but, rather, the death and resurrection of Christ underlie the figurative meaning of baptism.

[ἀπεθάνομεν, *we died* (not, *are dead*, E. V.), is the historic aorist, as ἥμαρτον, v. 12, and ἀπεθάνετε σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ, Col. ii. 20; comp. Gal. ii. 19, νόμῳ ἀπέθανον; Rom. vii. 4. The act of dying refers to the time of baptism, ver. 3 (Bengel, Meyer, Philippi, Alford, Wordsworth), which, in the Apostolic Church, usually coincided with conversion and justification, and implied a giving up of the former life of sin, and the beginning of a new life of holiness. The remission of sin, which is divinely assured and sealed by baptism, is the death of sin. Sin forgiven is hated, sin unforgiven is cherished. This, too, shows the inseparable connection between justification and sanctification; and yet they are kept distinct: the justified is sanctified, not *vice versâ*; first we are freed from the *guilt* (*reatus*) of sin, then from the *dominion* of sin; and we are freed from the one *in order* to be freed from the other. τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, as far as regards sin; it is the dative of reference, as Gal. ii. 19; 1 Peter ii. 24; while in Col. ii. 20 Paul uses ἀπό with the genitive in the same sense. A similar phrase is σταυροῦσθαι τῷ κόσμῳ, Gal. vi. 14, *to be crucified to the world*, so as to destroy all vital connection with it, and to have no more to do with it, except to oppose and hate it. πῶς expresses the possibility, which is denied by the question (Meyer), with a feeling of indignation (Grotius: *indignum est si loti in lutum revolvimur*). ζήσομεν covers the whole future. To live in sin, to hold any connection with it, is henceforth and forever incompatible with justification.—P. S.]

Ver. 3. **Know ye not [Or are ye ignorant,** ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε;]. This form of speech, like chap. vii. 1, is undoubtedly a reminder of something already known to the readers (Tholuck), yet it imparts at the same time a more definite consciousness and a fuller view of what is known. "It is very questionable," says Tholuck, "whether other apostles exhibit baptism with the same mystical profoundness as Paul did." But 1 Peter iii. 17–22 is a modification of the same fundamental thought. So, too, 1 John v. 4–6. [Paul evidently regarded baptism not merely as a sign, but also as an effective means of grace (comp. Gal. iii. 27; Col. ii. 12; Titus iii. 5; Eph. v. 26); else he would have reminded his readers of their conversion rather than their baptism. We must always remember, however, that in the first missionary age of the Church the baptism of adults implied, as a rule, genuine conversion—the baptism of Simon Magus being an exception.—P. S.]

That so many of us (all we who were). Ὅσοι, *quotquot*. [It denotes universality, *as many of us as*, *all without exception*, but it is not stronger than οἵτινες, which indicates the quality, *such of us as*.—P. S.] The phrase βαπτίζειν εἰς retains the most direct figurative reference of baptism. It means strictly, to immerse into Christ (Rückert)—that is, into the fellowship of Christ. [Comp. ver. 4: βάπτισμα εἰς θάνατον; Gal. iii. 27: εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε; Matt. xxviii. 19: εἰς τὸ ὄνομα. Alford: "'Into participation of,' 'into union with' Christ, in His capacity of spiritual Mastership, Headship, and Pattern of conformity."—P. S.] The explanation of Meyer [accepted by Hodge], that it never means any thing else than *to baptize in reference to*, *with relation to*, and that the more specific definitions must arise from the context, fails to do justice to this original meaning. [Comp. Lange and Schaff on *Matthew*, pp. 555 (*Textual Note* [3]), 557, 558, 560.—P. S.] But the baptizing into the full, living fellowship of Christ, is, as the Apostle remarks, a baptism into the fellowship of His death. And there is implied here, according to the idea of a covenant, the Divine adjudication of this saving fellowship on the one hand, and the human obligation for an ethical continuance of the fellowship on the other. The explanation of Grotius and others, *the idea of imitation*, is digressive, and weakens the sense. See Gal. iii. 27; Col. ii. 11; Titus iii. 5.

Ver. 4. **Therefore we were buried with him** [συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ

* [Tholuck quotes from Rungius: "*Significat non modo vulgarem quandam obstinentiam a proposito peccandi, sed quandam ἀντιπάθειαν, qualis est inter mortuos et vivos.*"—P. S.]

βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον. To be buried is a stronger expression than *to die*, for the burial confirms death and raises it beyond doubt; it withdraws the dead from our sight, and annihilates him, as it were. The same figure in Col. ii. 12. The mystic σύν in συντάφομαι, as also in συναποθνήσκω, συσταυροῦμαι, &c., signifies the *life*-union of the believer with Christ; comp. the remarks of Tholuck, p. 281 f.—P. S.]. Buried in death; an oxymoron, according to which burial precedes and death follows, as is illustrated in the immersion into the bath of baptism. The analogous feature in the life of Christ was His rejection by the world, and His violent death on the cross. The expression denotes not only a burial before death and for death, but it is likewise an expression of the decision and completion of death, and, finally, a reference to the transition from death to the resurrection. The finished κατάδυσις, as the bringing about of the ἀνάδυσις; Col. ii. 12.*

Into death [εἰς τὸν θάνατον]. The death of Christ is not merely a death of the individual Jesus, but the death which, in principle or power, comprehends all mankind, and which absolutely separates the old world and the new world. Therefore it must not here be particularized (Calov.: the declared death of sin; others give different interpretations). [Εἰς τὸν θάνατον must be closely connected with βαπτίσματος, baptism into the death of Christ for the appropriation of its full benefit, viz., the remission of sins and reconciliation with God.—P. S.]

In order that, as Christ was raised up [ἵνα ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ Πατρός, κ.τ.λ.]. The purpose of dying with Christ. The power that raised our Lord was the δόξα of the Father. Thus the resurrection of Christ is traced back to the highest Cause. God is the Father, as Origin and Author of the spiritual world comprehended in Christ. Before the Father's name the creature-world ascends into the spiritual world, and the spiritual world is conjoined in the Son. The glory of the Father is the concentrated revelation of all the attributes of the Father in their unity, especially of His omnipotence (1 Cor. vi. 14; Eph. i. 19), wisdom, and goodness; or of His omnipotent love in its faithfulness, and of His personality in its most glorious deed.* Before the glory of the Father the whole living world goes to ruin, is doomed to death, in order that the dead Christ may be made alive as Prince of the resurrection. Applications of the δόξα to the divinity of Christ (Theodoret [ἡ οἰκεία θεότης], and others), *in gloriam patris* (Beza [inadmissible on account of διά with the genitive]); *in paterna gloria resurrexit* (Castalio).

From the dead, ἐκ νεκρῶν. The world of the dead is regarded as a connected sphere. Also antithesis to εἰς θάνατον.

So we also should walk in newness of life [οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν]. *In newness of life;* that is, in a new kind and form of life, which is subsequently denoted as incorruptibility, and therefore also by implication as continual newness and perpetual renewal of existence. Consequently, more than ζωὴ καινή (Grotius).† [Meyer, Alford: "Not 'a new life;'—nor are such expressions ever to be diluted away thus."—P. S.] *Walk* gives prominence to the practical proof of this newness in new, free conduct of life.

Ver. 5. **For if we have grown together** [εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν]. The expression σύμφυτος, denoting originally *inborn* [innate]; *born with* [congenital, connate], means here the same as συμφυής, *grown together by nature.* [Grotius: *coaluimus;* Tholuck, Philippi, Meyer: *zusammengewachsen, verwachsen mit, concretus;* Stuart: *become homogeneous;* Alford: *intimately and progressively united.*—P. S.] The expression *complantati* (Vulgate, Luther [E. V.: *planted together*]) goes too far, and is not justified by the language;‡ while the interpretation *grafted into* (Erasmus [Calvin, Estius, Conybeare and Howson], and others) does not express enough here [and would require ἐμφύτευτος, *insititius*.—P. S.] The figure denotes believers as a unity of different branches in one root or one trunk. These characters, which are united in one spirit, as the grapes of a cluster, have sprung from one gospel or new principle of life. Thus believers have grown into an *image* or *analogue of the death* of Jesus (τῷ ὁμοιώματι, dative of direction), but not *with* such an analogue (Meyer, Tho-

* [All commentators of note (except Stuart and Hodge) expressly admit or take it for granted that in this verse, especially in συνετάφημεν and ἠγέρθη, the ancient prevailing mode of baptism by immersion and emersion is implied, as giving additional force to the idea of the going down of the old and the rising up of the new man. Chrysostom on John iii., Hom. xxv. (al. xxiv., *Opp.*, tom. viii. p. 151): Καθάπερ ἐν τινι τάφῳ, τῷ ὕδατι καταδυόντων ἡμῶν τὰς κεφαλὰς, ὁ παλλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος θάπτεται, καὶ καταδὺς κάτω κρύπτεται ὅλως καθάπαξ· εἶτα ἀνανευόντων ἡμῶν, ὁ καινὸς ἄνεισι πάλιν. He then quotes Col. ii. 12; Rom. vi. 6. Bloomfield: "There is a plain allusion to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion; on which, see Suicer's *Thes.* and Bingham's *Antiquities.*" Barnes: "It is altogether probable that the Apostle has allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion." Conybeare and Howson: "This passage cannot be understood, unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion." Webster and Wilkinson: "Doubtless there is an allusion to immersion, as the usual mode of baptism, introduced to show that baptism symbolised also our spiritual resurrection, ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη X." Comp. also Bengel, Rückert, Tholuck, Meyer. The objection of Philippi (who, however, himself regards this allusion probable in ver. 4), that in this case the Apostle would have expressly mentioned the symbolic act, has no force in view of the daily practice of baptism. But immersionists, on the other hand, make an unwarranted use of this passage. It should be remembered, that immersion is not commanded here, but simply alluded to, and that the *immersion*, or κατάδυσις, is only one part of the baptismal act, symbolising the going down of the old man of sin; and that the *emersion*, or ἀνάδυσις, of the new man of righteousness, is just as essential to complete the idea. Hence, irrespective of other considerations, the substitution of the onesided and secular term *immersion* for *baptism*, in a revision of the English Bible, would give a merely negative view of the meaning of the sacrament. Baptism, and the corresponding verb, which have long since become naturalised in the English language, as much so as *Christ, apostle, angel*, &c., are the only terms to express properly the use of water for *sacred, sacramental* purposes, and the idea of resurrection as well as of death and burial with Christ. Immersion is undoubtedly a more expressive form than sprinkling; yet the efficacy of the sacrament does not depend upon the quantity or quality of water, nor upon the mode of its application.—P. S.]

* [δόξα and δύναμις are closely related; comp. the Hebrew עֹז, and τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης. Col. i. 11. Meyer explains δόξα, *die glorreiche Gesammtvollkommenheit Gottes.*—P. S.]

† [So also Koppe, Reiche, Stuart: "Καινότητι τῆς ζωῆς I regard as a Hebraistic form, in which the first noun supplies the place of the adjective." Against this dilution, comp. Winer, p. 211, Meyer and Alford *in loc.* The abstract noun καινότης gives greater prominence to the quality of *newness*, which is the chief point here; comp. 1 Thess. ii. 11; 1 Tim. vi. 17.—P. S.]

‡ [σύμφυτος is not derived from φυτεύω, *to plant* (φυτευτός, used by Plato), but from φύω, or φύομαι, *to grow.* Comp. on the different meanings of σύμφυτος Reiche, Fritzsche, and Philippi *in loc.*—P. S.]

tuck), with which we cannot connect any clear thought. [Philippi and Meyer explain: grown together, or, intimately connected with the likeness of His death; the ὁμοίωμα being spiritual death, so that the meaning is: If we are spiritually dead to sin, as Christ was physically dead, &c. So in the other clause our spiritual resurrection is the ὁμοίωμα of the bodily resurrection of Christ.—P. S.] Neither can τῷ ὁμοιώματι be the dative of instrument: We have grown together with Christ [τῷ Χριστῷ being understood as in ver. 6] *through* the resemblance of His death-baptism, the likeness of His death (Erasmus [Beza, Grotius], Fritzsche, Baur [Van Hengel], and most others). For [this would require αὐτῷ after σύμφυτοι, and] believers are not grown together by the likeness of the death of Christ, but by His death itself in a religious sense, as cause (through the medium of the gospel), in order that, as an organism, they should now exhibit as a copy His death in the ethical sense.

We shall be also with his resurrection [ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα]. The antithesis is strengthened by ἀλλά [which is used sometimes also by the classics for the rapid and emphatic introduction of the antithetical idea in the apodosis after a hypothetical protasis; see Meyer *in loc.*, and Hartung, *Partikellehre*, ii. p. 40.—P. S.]. We shall also be grown together with Him into the likeness of His resurrection (Beza, Grotius, Meyer, Philippi; Tholuck: "abbreviated comparative"). Not σύμφυτοι τῆς ἀναστάσεως (Erasmus, Calvin, Olshausen, and others).* The reference of the expression to the resurrection of the body (by Tertullian, and others) is not in harmony with the context (see ver. 4); yet is altogether authorized by ver. 9, if we regard the new life as continuing to the bodily resurrection (therefore an ethical and physical resurrection, which Meyer and Tholuck oppose). The future, ἐσόμεθα, is indeed not imperative (Reiche [Olshausen, Stuart: expressive of obligation]); nor does it denote willingness (Fritzsche), but the certainty of the result, the necessary consequence of dying together with Christ [Tholuck, Meyer, Hodge], if we understand thereby not merely a natural consequence, but an ethical one, which involves an ever-new willingness. This is likewise indicated by what immediately follows.

Ver. 6. **Knowing this.** That objective relation of the resurrection is not only confirmed by the subjective consciousness (Meyer), but it is also conditioned by it.

That our old man [ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος]. Meyer: *our old ego.* This is liable to misunderstanding, and expresses too much. Meyer further explains: "Personification of the entire state of sinfulness before the παλιγγενεσία (John iii. 3; Titus iii. 5; Eph. iv. 22;; Col. iii. 9)." This expresses too little. The old man is the whole sinfulness of man, which, proceeding from Adam, and pervading the old world and making it old, has become, in the concrete human image, the pseudo-plasmatic phantom of human nature and the human form † (see chap. viii. 3). Tholuck's explanation is almost unintelligible: "Indication of the *ego* of the earlier personality; as in ἔσω ἄνθρωπος, ὁ κρυπτὸς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἄνθρωπος, 1 Peter iii. 4."*

Was [not **is,** as in the E. V.] **crucified with him** [συνεσταυρώθη, comp. Gal. ii. 20: Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι· ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός]. "Namely, at the time when we were baptized," says Meyer [referring to vers. 3, 4]. But this is rather a superficial view. Baptism has actually and individually realized a connection which had already been realized potentially and generally in the death on the cross; see 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; Gal. ii. 19; Col. iii. 1. Tholuck: "Calovius says very properly against Grotius: σύν *non* SIMILITUDINEM *notat, verum* SIMULTATEM, *ut ita dicam, et* COMMUNIONEM. The accessory idea of pain, or of gradual death [advocated by Grotius, Stuart, Barnes], could hardly have been thought of in this connection by the Apostle." Yet we are also reminded of the violence and effective energy of the death on the cross by the following: in order that the body of sin might be destroyed. The destructive power of the death on the cross involves not merely pain and sorrow, but also the ignominy of the cross of Christ. According to Meyer, Paul only made use of the expression because Christ had died on the cross.

In order that the body of sin might be destroyed [ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας; comp. τὸ σῶμα τῆς σαρκός, Col. ii. 11, and τὸ σῶμα τοῦ θανάτου τούτου, Rom. vii. 24]. It is self-evident, from Paul and the whole Bible, that there is not the slightest reference here to a [literal] destruction of the body [*i. e.*, of this physical organism which is only dissolved in physical death, and which, instead of being annihilated, is to be sanctified; comp. 1 Cor. vi. 20; 1 Thess. v. 23; Rom. xiii. 14.—P. S.]. As "the old man" is the pseudo-plasmatic phantom of man, so is "the body of sin" the phantom of a body in man consisting of his whole sinfulness; and so, further on, is the body of death (chap. vii. 24) the phantom of a corporeal power of death encompassing man. It is remarkable that most of the later expositors (with the exception of Philippi, p. 210 ff.) reject the constructions that are most nearly correct, to substitute for them others which are dualistic.

1. *Figurative* explanations. Sin under the *figure* of a body.

a. The totality of sin (Origen, Grotius). [Chrysostom: ἡ ὁλόκληρος ἁμαρτία. Calvin: "*Corpus*

* [Grammatically, this is not impossible, since σύμφυτος is constructed with the genitive as well as with the dative; but τῇ ἀναστάσει would have been more natural in this case; hence it is better to supply σύμφυτοι τῷ ὁμοιώματι, so that τῆς ἀναστάσεως depends upon τ. ὁμοιώματι.—P. S.]

† [One of Lange's hardest sentences: "*Der alte Mensch ist die einheitliche Sündhaftigkeit des Menschen, wie sie von Adam ausgehend, die alte Welt durchziehend und zur alten machend in dem concreten Menschenbilde zum pseudoplasmatischen Scheinbilde der Menschennatur und Menschengestalt geworden ist.*" In like manner he explains "the body of death," vii. 24, and "the law in the members," vii. 23, with reference to the physiological and medical doctrine of plasma and pseudo-plasma, as if Paul had by intuition anticipated modern science.—P. S.]

* [The παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος is the σάρξ personified, or the ἐγὼ σαρκικός, chap. vii. 14, 18—*i. e.*, the fallen, sinful nature before regeneration, in opposition to the καινὸς, or νέος ἄνθρωπος, or the καινὴ κτίσις, the renewed, regenerated man; Col. iii. 9, 10; Eph. iv. 22-24; 2 Cor. v. 17. The term *man* is used because sin controls the whole personality, as, on the other hand, regeneration is a radical change of the whole man with all his faculties and dispositions. The phrase, *the old man, the man of sin,* is traced to rabbinical origin by Schöttgen, Bloomfield, Stuart; but the passage quoted by Schöttgen from the comparatively recent *Sohar-chadash* (first published in 1599) has a different meaning, according to Tholuck, p. 287. The Talmud, however, calls proselytes "new creatures," and says of them: "they became as little children;" see Schöttgen, *Hor.* i. p. 328, 704 f.; Wetstein and Meyer on 2 Cor. v. 17. Meyer says: "The *form* of the expression (καινὴ κτίσις) is rabbinical; for the Rabbins considered a convert to Judaism as בריה חדוה." The Christian *idea* of the παλιγγενεσία of course, is far deeper."—P. S.]

peccati non carnem et ossa, sed massam designat." More accurately: Sin is personified as a living organism with many members (vices), which may be put to death. So Philippi: "*Die Masse der Sünde als gegliederter Organismus.*" Bloomfield: "Τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας is the same with ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος, and means that sin is a body consisting of many particular members or vices, an *imperium in imperio.*"—P. S.]

b. The nature or substance of sin (Schöttgen).

c. The figure of sin with reference to the figure of the crucifixion (Calov., Wolf, and others).

d. "The tendency of alienation from God and conformity to the pleasures of the world" (J. Müller, and others; Tholuck, p. 290).

e. More strongly: The whole man in his departure from God; the natural man (Augustin, Luther, Calvin [Hodge: "The body of sin" is only another name for "the old man," or rather for its concrete form]).

f. Reduced to a minimum: Bad habit (Pelagius).

2. *Literal* explanations:

a. The flesh as flesh of sin, σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας (Rosenmüller).

b. "The body belonging to the principle of sin, the body ruled by sin." The old man had such a body, and this σῶμα, *as far* as it is a body of sin, should be completely destroyed by crucifixion with Christ" (Meyer). An utter confusion of the figurative and literal construction. [Winer, *Gramm.*, p. 177: the body which belongs to sin, in which sin has its existence and dominion, almost the same with σῶμα τῆς σαρκός, Col. i. 22. Similarly Alford, after De Wette: the body, which belongs to or serves sin, in which sin rules or is manifested, = τὰ μέλη, ver. 13, in which is ὁ νόμος τῆς ἁμαρτίας, vii. 23. Wordsworth: the body of sin is our body, so far as it is the seat and instrument of sin, and the slave of sin.—P. S.]

c. The body as σῶμα τῆς σαρκός, and the latter the seat of sin (Semler, Usteri, Rückert, Ritschl, Rothe, Hofmann; see Tholuck, p. 290).*

3. The anti-dualistic expositors, who interpreted this σῶμα as the real body or the natural man, were compelled to render improperly the καταργηθῇ, as: *evacuaretur*, might be made inoperative and powerless. [Tertullian, Augustin; also Stuart and Barnes: might be deprived of efficiency, power, life. Alford: rendered powerless, annulled, as far as regards energy and activity.—P. S.]

That henceforth we should not be slaves to sin. [Calvin: "*finem abolitionis notat.*"] Sin is regarded as the controlling power (see ver. 16); John viii. 44. If this power is to be broken, the body of sin must be crucified. The reason for this is given in what follows. [τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ is a more concrete expression of the aim than the preceding clause, ἵνα καταργηθῇ, κ.τ.λ. See Winer, p. 569.—P. S.]

Ver. 7. **For he that hath died is acquitted from sin.** [Ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας; comp. 1 Peter iv. 1: ὅτι ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκὶ, πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας. The interpretations of this passage depend upon the meaning of ἀποθανών, whether it is to be taken in a physical, or in a moral (legal), or in a spiritual (mystic) sense.—P. S.] The chief and only question here is not ethical dying, or dying with Christ (Erasmus, Calvin, Cocceius, Bengel, Olshausen [De Wette, Philippi], and others. And the reason for this is, first, because justification must not be regarded as the consequence, but the cause of the ethical dying with Christ. Second, because not merely the being justified or freed from sin should be proved, in and of itself, but the being justified or freed from sin by death. An earlier, already present, universal, moral, and theocratical law of life is thus used to illustrate the new, religious, and ethical law of life in Christianity, in the same way that chap. vii. 1–6 has reference to such a law. The universal principle which the Apostle makes his groundwork here in the figurative expression, is the word in ver. 23: *The wages of sin is death.* The Grecian and Roman form of this antithesis was: by execution the offender is justified and separated from his crime (Alethæus, Wolf, and others). The theocratic form was the same decree of death for sin, according to Gen. ii. 17; ix. 6; Lev. xxiii. 1 ff. The sinner who was made a curse-offering, Cherem, was morally destroyed in a symbolical sense, but, at the same time, his guilt also, as well as his life of sin, was destroyed in a symbolical sense. According to Gen. ii. 17, the same thing held good of natural death, not so far as it, as a momentary power, put an end to the sinner's present life (Chrysostom, and others), but rather because it made a penal suffering extending into eternity (Sheol) the punishment of sin. All these modifications are grouped in the primitive law: *death is the wages of sin;* and this is the law which the Apostle makes the image of the Christian law of life. The Christian dies to sin by being crucified with Christ. Now, the being justified does not mean here justification by faith in itself (although dying with Christ is connected therewith), but justification as a release from sin by the death of the sinner himself. Because Meyer ignores the complete Old Testament idea of death, he attacks the statute of Jewish theology: death, as the punishment of sin, atones for the guilt of sin. He explains the Apostle's declaration thus: "He is made a δίκαιος by death, not as if he were now free from the guilt of his sins committed in life, but so far as he sins no more." The explanation of ethical death with Christ (Rothe, Philippi, and others already mentioned) here makes what is to be proved the proof itself (as Meyer properly remarks). Meyer refers the passage to physical death as exit from the present life—a view in which regard is not paid to penal suffering.* Better than this is the view: As activity ceases in the dead, and sin with it, so should it also be with you who have died with Christ (Theodoret, Melanchthon, Grotius). But there is the same inadequateness of the comparison. Tholuck's exposition is utterly untenable (with reference to Calvin, Bengel, Spener, and others), that sin should here be regarded as a creditor who has just claims on man, &c.; for, while a debtor is released by death from his creditor, there is by no means a δικαιοῦσθαι of the debtor from his debt.†

* [Tholuck takes σῶμα in the literal sense, but viewed as the *seat* and *organ* of sin (p. 303), and enters in this connection into a full discussion of the meaning of σάρξ, and its relation to sin, p. 296 ff.; but the proper place for a biblico-psychological excursus on σάρξ, σῶμα, ψυχή, νοῦς, πνεῦμα, is chap. vii. See below.—P. S.]

* [Meyer's view is, that he who is physically dead is free from sin, because he is free from the body, the seat of sin. But this, as Philippi remarks, is contrary to the biblical and Pauline anthropology.—P. S.]

† [We add the views of leading English and American commentators: Scott, Macknight, and Hodge: He who is dead *with Christ* is freed from the guilt and punishment of sin by justification. Stuart and Barnes: The Apostle applies a common Jewish proverb concerning physical death

Ver. 8. Now if we died with Christ, &c. [Εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ]. δὲ announces the transition to the new thought, that believers, having died with Christ, would also live with Him. But this is not a mere conclusion from the being dead to the new life; the accent rests on the qualification *with Christ*, because Christ lives. As we are dead with Christ in His death, in its profoundest meaning and effect—which death comprises the separation from the entire old world, and its sin and vanity—so do **we believe that we shall also live with him** [πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συνζήσομεν αὐτῷ] in the supremely highest and most intense life—which life is *eternal*, and is an eternal *life*. Meyer emphasizes simply the inference from the ethical death with Christ to ethical participation in the new and enduring life of Christ. He is much in error in excluding here [with Philippi] the idea of the Christian's future share in the blessedness of the glorified Saviour (see chap. viii.), as Origen, Chrysostom, Grotius, Reiche, and others are in confining συνζήσομεν to the future life. Rosenmüller, Tholuck, and others, have properly comprised both these elements; yet the chief emphasis rests upon the assurance of the new ethical life as implying the full freedom from all sin in the fellowship of Christ. Tholuck, with Erasmus, Calvin, and others, emphasizes *once for all* [ἐφάπαξ, ver. 10] as an eternal destination to new life. This destination is commensurate with the certainty of being dead with Christ. Yet, granting full force to the conclusion, it is still an object of faith (πιστεύομεν), which rests mainly on Christ as the risen One. (Different interpretations of πιστεύομεν: Confidence in Divine assistance, Fritzsche; in the Divine promise, Baumgarten-Crusius; in God as the Finisher of the commenced work of grace, Philippi [comp. 1 Thess. v. 24, 2 Thess. iii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 11]).

Ver. 9. **Knowing, &c.** From faith in the risen One there arises the certain knowledge that henceforth He can never die; because He could die but once, inasmuch as, with the guilt of sin, He had assumed also the judgment of death. [Alford: Death could not hold Him, and had no power over Him further than by His own sufferance; but power over Him it had, inasmuch as He died. Meyer: The κυριεύειν of death over Christ was decreed by God (v. 8–10), and brought about by Christ's voluntary obedience (John x. 18; Matt. xx. 28). The conviction that Christ lives for ever furnishes the ground and support to our own life-union with Him.]

Ver. 10. **For in that he died, or, the death which he died.** The expression, ὃ ἀπέθανεν, may mean: as far as His death is concerned (Winer); or, as far as the death which He died is concerned (De Wette); or *that wh ch He died*, so that ὅ is viewed as the subject [or rather as the accusative of the object; comp. Gal. ii. 20: ὃ δὲ νῦν ζῶ.—P. S.]. We prefer the last exposition, but do not refer the ὅ, with Benecke (after Hilarius, and others) to the mortal part of Christ [that which died in Christ], but to Christ's great and unexampled experience of death. All his dying was abhorrence of sin, induced by sin, directed against sin.—**Unto sin he died** [τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ* ἀπέθανεν]. Explanations: *ad expianda peccata* (Grotius, Olshausen); or, *ad expianda et tollenda p.* (Tholuck [Reiche, Fritzsche], Philippi); [or, to destroy the power of sin (Chrysostom, Beza, Calvin, Bengel, Ewald]). Indefinite reference to death (Rückert, De Wette [Alford], and others). Meyer: His death paid the debt to sin, and now it can have no more power over Him. Hofmann: With His death, all passive relation to sin has ceased. Certainly the parallel in ver. 11 [νεκροὺς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ] seems to require a similar rendering. Yet we must not merely bring out prominently the repulsiveness of sin to the life of Jesus, but rather the repulsiveness of His life to sin—which repulsiveness was consummated in His death. Both together constitute the absolute separation.

Once [ἐφάπαξ]. Once for all. [The one sacrifice on the cross, as the sacrifice of the infinite Son of God, has infinite value both as to extent and time, and hence excludes repetition; comp. Heb. vii. 27; ix. 12, 26, 28; x. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 18.—P. S.]

But in that he liveth, or, the life that he liveth [ὃ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ Θεῷ]. All His life, His whole glorious life, is *for God*. As His death consisted wholly in the ethical reaction against sin, so His life consists wholly in consecration to God, His honor, and His kingdom. [Christ's life on earth was also a life for God, but in conflict with sin and death, over which He triumphed in the resurrection.—P. S.] Theophylact's view is wrong: by the power of God.

Ver. 11. **Thus reckon ye also yourselves (account yourselves) dead indeed unto sin** [Οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ]. A λογίζεσθαι of Christ does not stand as a parallel to λογίζεσθε (which is imperative, and not indicative, as Bengel would have it).† It should rather be derived from the meaning of the death of Christ, according to ver. 10.

But alive unto God in Christ Jesus [ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ.]. That is, in fellowship, or living union with Him (not merely *through* Him).‡ It refers not simply to living to God (Rückert, De Wette [Alford]), but also to being dead to sin [Reiche, Meyer]. The λογίζεσθε requires of Christians that they should understand what they are as Christians, as members of Christ, according to the duties of common fellowship (Tholuck, Philippi); but not that they should attain to this condition by moral effort

to one who is spiritually dead as to sin—*i. e.*, he must become free of its influence. Bloomfield: He whose corrupt nature has been crucified with Christ is freed from its power and slavery. Alford: As a man that is dead is released from guilt and bondage among men: so a man that has died to sin is acquitted from the guilt of sin and released of its bondage, so that sin (personified) has no more claims on him, either as a creditor or as a master, cannot detain him for debt, nor sue him for service. Forbes combines the view of legal freedom from the guilt of sin (Fraser, Haldane) with the interpretation of spiritual freedom from the power and dominion of sin. "It is to sin as a whole, to its power as well as to its guilt, that the believer has virtually died in Christ as his representative and substitute." All is already objectively accomplished in Christ, yet remains to be realised subjectively in the believer's individual experience, which will not be completed till after the literal death of the body.—P. S.]

* [The dative of reference or relation; in point of fact, in the case of ἁμαρτίᾳ it is the *Dativus incommodi*, or *detrimenti*; while in the next clause τῷ θεῷ is the *Dat. commodi*.—P. S.]

† [The indicative would rather require: οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς λογιζόμεθα, instead of the second person. Alford is quite mistaken, when he says: "Meyer only holds it to be *indicative*." Meyer, on the co trary, takes λογίζεσθε to be the *imperative*, in harmony with the hortative character of what follows.—P. S.]

‡ [Meyer: ἐν X. 'I. is not *per Christum* (Grotius, Fritzsche, *al.*), but denotes the *element in which* the being dead and being alive holds. Comp. Winer, *Gramm.*, p. 364—P. S.]

(Baur). That is, Christian life proceeds upon the believing presupposition of our completion in Christ; but this completion is not, reversely, brought to pass by a moral effort. Of course, the telic completion then meets the principial completion as the goal of effort.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1 See the *Preliminary Remarks* on chaps. vi.–viii., and the inscription to the present section, chap. vi. 1–11.

2. On chap. vi. 1. The false conclusion which *anomianism* has ever derived from the fact that sin, in its complete development, occasions a still more glorious revelation of grace, rests on the erroneous supposition that the ethical and organic relation on both sides is a purely natural relation, which justifies to an altogether passive conduct in religious and moral things. This anomianism appears in Indian heathendom, as well as in modern humanitarianism, chiefly in a pantheistic form. But in Christian religiousness it appears only sporadically in this form; yet mostly, on the other hand, in dualistic forms. This is as much as to say, that if the flesh be indulged in its sphere, the spirit will likewise maintain the ascendency in its sphere; or, grace will overcome sin, and the like. But in every form this anomianism is to the Apostle an object of religious and moral abhorrence, which he expresses by μὴ γένοιτο. He opposes this false conclusion by the truth of the relation according to which the whole of Christianity is rooted in a thoroughly religious and moral act—the death of Jesus.

3. *Baptism*, in its full meaning, is a dying with Christ, which is potentially grounded in the dynamic meaning of His dying for all (2 Cor. v. 14), and is actually realized in the dynamical genesis of faith. It follows from this that it is not only a partial purification of the living sinner, but his fundamental purification by a spiritual death and burial; that, further, it not merely represents sensibly and seals the single parts and acts of the Christian life, but its whole justification, in all its parts; and therefore that it is available, operative, and obligatory once for all. It follows, finally, that baptism is not simply an ecclesiastical act performed on the individual, when the individual is passive, but an ethical covenant-transaction between Christ and the one who is baptized; wherefore even the baptism of children presupposes in the family, the parents, or the sponsors, a spirit of faith which represents and encompasses the child.

From all this it will be seen how very much baptism is obscured and desecrated by regarding it either as a mere ceremony which certifies the Christian life of the person baptized, or, on the other hand, as a onesided and magical act which is supposed to create the Christian life.

[In opposition to the low and almost rationalistic views now prevailing in a large part of Protestantism on the meaning and import of Christian baptism, it may be well to refer to the teaching of the symbols of the Reformation down to the Westminster standards, and of the older divines, which is far deeper. Take, for instance, the Westminster *Confession of Faith* (chap. xxviii.): "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life." (Comp. the *Larger Catechism*, Qu. 165, and *Shorter Catechism*, Qu. 94). Calvin says: "In treating the sacraments, two things are to be considered: the sign and the thing signified. Thus, in baptism, the sign is water; but the thing signified is the cleansing of the soul by the blood of Christ, and the mortification of the flesh. Both of these things are comprised in the institution of Christ; and whereas often the sign appears to be ineffectual and fruitless, that comes through men's abuse, which does not annul the nature of the sacrament. Let us learn, therefore, not to tear apart the thing signified from the sign; though, at the same time, we must be on our guard against the opposite fault, such as prevails among Papists. For, failing to make the needful distinction between the thing and the sign, they stop short at the outward element, and there confidently rest their hope of salvation. The sight of the water, accordingly, withdraws their minds from Christ's blood and the grace of the Spirit. Not reflecting that, of all the blessings there exhibited, Christ alone is the Author, they transfer to water the glory of His death, and bind the hidden energy of the Spirit to the visible sign. What, then, must be done? Let us not separate what the Lord has joined together. We ought, in baptism, to recognize a spiritual laver; we ought in it to embrace a witness to the remission of sins and a pledge of our renewal; and yet so to leave both to Christ and the Holy Spirit the honor that is theirs, as that no part of the salvation be transferred to the sign."—Dr. John Lillie, in his excellent posthumous *Lectures on the Epistles of Peter* (New York, 1869, p. 252), in commenting on 1 Peter iii. 21, remarks: "But what, you will ask, is baptism, then, a saving ordinance? Certainly; that is just what Christ's Apostle here affirms. Nor is this the only place, by any means, in which the New Testament speaks of baptism in a way that would now offend many good people, were it not that the perplexing phraseology is unquestionably scriptural. Recollect, for instance, Peter's own practical application of his pentecostal sermon: 'Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.' And so Ananias in Damascus to the humbled persecutor: 'Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins.' Paul, too, expressly calls baptism 'the laver of the water' by which Christ purifies His Church; and again, 'the laver of regeneration' by which God saves us. Frequently, also, he represents it as that by which we are united to Christ, and made partakers of His death and resurrection. Nay, Christ Himself, in sending forth His gospel among all nations, named baptism as one condition of salvation. We need not, then, hesitate to call it a saving ordinance. But how does it save? Just as any other ordinance saves—not through any inherent virtue of its outward signs and processes, but solely as it is a channel for the communication of Divine grace, and used in accordance with the Divine intention. On the one hand, while grace is ordinarily dispensed through ordinances, it is not confined to them, God being ever higher than His own appointments, and acting, when it so pleases Him, independently of them altogether. And, on the other hand, there must be on the part of man, besides the observance of formal precept, a yielding of his whole nature to the quickening and transforming influence. Take for an ex

ample that greatest ordinance, the Word of God. It 'is able,' says James (i. 21), 'to save your souls.' But how? Not simply as it is preached, or heard, or read. That it may be 'the power of God unto salvation,' it must first be accompanied with the 'demonstration of the Spirit,' and then 'received with meekness,' and so become the ingrafted word. It is not the foolishness of preaching that saves; but 'it pleases God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.' Now, just so with baptism: equally with the gospel itself, it is a Divine institution, whereby God ordinarily dispenses His grace. But its whole efficacy is due to that grace of God, and to our fitting reception and use of the rite—not to its mere external administration, by whatsoever priestly or apostolic hand."—P. S.]

4. According to the Apostle, the *burial* as well as the *death of Christ* is represented in the meaning and effect of baptism. But as the burial of Christ not only seals His death, but also brings to pass the mysterious form of His transition to new life, so is it also with the world's renunciation of the secret inward life of the Christian, which develops from a germ in mysterious growth, and is hid with Christ in God. (For fuller information on being baptized into the death of Christ, see Tholuck, p. 280, and Philippi, p. 205.)

5. Christianity is not only a *new* life, but a *newness* of life—a life which never grows old, but has ever a more perfect and imperishable renewal. But as the resurrection of Christ rests on a deed of *the glory* of the Father, so is it with the new birth of the Christian. See the *Exeg. Notes*.

6. Although believers are so intimately connected or grown together in a living organism as to appear to be living on the same vine or the same branch, they are nevertheless not grown together in the form of natural necessity. While unchurchly and unhistorical sectarianism ignores the organic internal character and historical structure of the Christian communion, hierarchism, on the other hand, disregards its ethical and free inward character. The life of Christ is repeated and reflected, after His death and resurrection, in His image—the Church; but not in the sense that it is quantitatively a supplement or substitute for Him, but that it completely unites itself qualitatively with Him as its living head. Because the Christian suffers death in Christ, rises, and is justified, Christ, as the crucified and risen One, lives in him. (See chap. viii. 29; Eph. i. 4; Col. i. 22, 23, 24; ii. 11; iii. 1, &c.)

7. The Apostle's doctrine of the *old man*, the *body of sin*, the *body of death*, the *law in the members*, &c., shows a divinatory anticipation of the idea of the pseudo-plasmas, which has first appeared in the modern science of medicine. The old man is not the real man, nor the natural man, but sin, which has pervaded man as the plasmatic phantom of his nature, and, as an ethical cancer, threatens to consume him. (On the various theological interpretations of the old man, see Tholuck, p. 287. For a more complete interpretation of Paul's pseudo-plasmatic ideas, see *Exeg. Notes* on chap. vii. 24.)

8. Those who designate the real body of man as the *source* of sin, abolish the real idea of sin. Even the expression, that the body is not the *source*, but the *seat* of sin, is not correct in reference to the tendency of the wicked, and is only conditionally correct in reference to the life of the pious, in whom sin, as sinfulness, as a tempting propensity in the bodily part of the being *has its seat*, and will continue to *have its seat*, until the old form of the body is laid off.

9. On being free from the debt of sin by death, see the *Exeg. Notes*. Death removes guilt—a definition which may be further formularized thus: the kind of death corresponds as justification to the kind of guilt; the depth of death corresponds to the depth of guilt. Therefore the death of Christ is the potential justification of humanity, because it plunged the absolutely guiltless and holy life into the absolute depth of the death of mankind.

10. On the expression *body of sin*, in ver. 6, compare the elaborate discussion by Tholuck, p. 288 ff. Likewise the same author, on ver. 9, or the relation of Christ to death; p. 306.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

On the relation of sin and grace: 1. It is true that the more powerful sin is, the more powerful is grace also; but it cannot be inferred from this, 2. That we should continue in sin. But, 3. We should wish, rather, not to live in sin, to which we died (vers. 1, 2).—To what would continuance in sin lead? 1. Not to grace, for he who sins wilfully, trifles with grace; but, 2. To the terrible looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the rebellious (vers. 1, 2). Heb. x. 26.—Of Christian baptism. 1. What is it? *a.* a baptism into Christ; *b.* a baptism into the death of Christ. 2. Of what service is baptism to us? *a.* We die and are buried by it in repentance; *b.* we are raised by it in faith (vers. 3, 4).—By baptism we enter into a double communion with Christ: 1. Of His death; 2. Of His resurrection.—Christians are, 1. Companions in the death of Christ; but also, 2. In His resurrection (ver. 5).—The crucifixion of our old man: 1. The manner and form of the old man; 2. his crucifixion.—The glorious immortality of Christ: 1. Its foundation; 2. Its importance to us (vers. 8–10).—We should reckon ourselves dead in relation to sin, but alive in relation to God; that is, 1. We should, by faith, be ever taking our stand-point more perfectly in Christ; and, 2. First of all in His death, but also in His life (ver. 11).

STARKE: The suffering and death of a Christian are not to destruction, but a planting to life.

HEDINGER: Under the grace of God we are not permitted to sin.—MÜLLER: Life and death cling together; the more the old dies and goes to ruin, the more gloriously does the new man arise.—Either you will slay sin, or sin will slay you.—Where faith is there is Christ, and where Christ is there is life.

GERLACH: The baptism of Christians is a baptism into Christ's death; that is, into the complete appropriation of its roots and fruits.

BESSER: Paul places the *gift of baptism* first and connects with it the *duty* of the one baptized.

HEUBNER: Recollections of our former covenant of baptism: 1. What has God done for us in baptism? 2. What have we to do in consequence of baptism?—THOMASIUS: The power of baptism in its permeation of the whole Christian life.—FLOREY: We are baptized into the death of Christ. Namely: 1. Upon the confession that He died for us; 2. On the pledge that we should die with Him; 3. In the hope that we shall live by Him.—HARLESS: The impediments to Christian life: 1. The pleasure of life, which is terrified at evangelical preaching on death; 2. The dulness and unbelief of spiritual death, which

is terrified at evangelical preaching on life; while yet, reversely, 3. The pleasure, power, and pious conduct of the Christian rests upon the death which he has died for newness of life.

[Sherlock: As the death of Christ was not barely a natural death, a separation of soul and body, but a sacrifice for sin, to destroy the dominion of it, so our dying to sin is the truest conformity to the death of Christ; and as we must consider His resurrection as His living to God and advancement into His spiritual kingdom, so our walking in newness of life is our conformity to His resurrection, and makes us true subjects of His spiritual kingdom.—Henry: As natural death brings a writ of ease to the weary, so must we be dead to all the sins of our former rebellious life. We must be as indifferent to the pleasures and delights of sin, as a man that is dying is to his former diversions. As natural death cuts off all communication with life, so must sanctification in the soul cut off all communication with sin.—Macknight: We should daily recollect our baptism, and be stirred up by it to every religious act and thought possible, for it is this that sets before us the death and resurrection of Christ.—Clarke: The sacrificial death of Christ is the soil in which believers are planted, and from which they derive their life, their fruitfulness, and their final glory.—Hodge: It is those who look to Christ not only for pardon, but for holiness, that are successful in subduing sin; the legalist remains its slave. To be in Christ is the source of the Christian's life; to be like Christ is the sum of his excellence; to be with Christ is the fulness of his joy.—J. F. H.]

Third Section.—*The principial freedom of Christians from the service of sin to death, and their actual departure therefrom and entrance into the service of righteousness unto life by the power of the death of Jesus. (Believers should live in the consciousness that they are dead to sin, just as even the slave is freed by death.)*

Chap. VI. 12–23.

12 Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in
13 [*omit* it in][1] the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye [Nor render][2] your members
as instruments [*or* weapons] of unrighteousness unto [to][3] sin: but yield [render] yourselves unto [to] God, as those that are alive [as being alive][4] from the
dead, and your members *as* instruments [*or* weapons] of righteousness unto [to]
14 God. For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the
[*omit* the][5] law, but under grace.
15 What then? shall [may][6] we sin, because we are not under the [*omit* the]
16 law, but under grace? God forbid. [Let it not be!] Know ye not, that to
whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye
obey; whether [either] of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?
17 But God be thanked [thanks to God], that ye were the servants of sin, but ye
have [*omit* have] obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine [teaching][7] which
18 was delivered you [whereunto ye were delivered;].[8] Being then [And being]
19 made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness. I speak after the
manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye have yielded
[rendered] your members [*as*] servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto
iniquity; even so now yield [render] your members [*as*] servants to righteous-
20 ness unto holiness [*or* sanctification].[9] For when ye were the [*omit* the] servants
21 of sin, ye were free from [as regards] righteousness. What fruit had ye then
in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? [What fruit had ye then therefore? Things whereof ye are now ashamed;][10] for[11] the end of those things
22 *is* death. But now being [having been] made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness [*or* sanctification], and the end
23 everlasting life. For the wages of sin *is* death; but the gift of God *is* eternal
life through Jesus Christ [in Christ Jesus][12] our Lord.

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver 12.—[The correct reading seems to be: ὑπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ, found in ℵ. A. B. C¹., many cursives, most versions and fathers; adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford *et al.* Griesbach, on insufficient authority, omits all after ὑπακούειν. D. F. insert αὐτῇ, omitting the rest. C³. K. L., some further insert αὐτῇ ἐν before ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. So *Rec.*; hence *it in* of the E. V. All these variations are accounted for by Meyer, who supposes that αὐτῇ was added, first as a marginal gloss, to direct attention to sin as the source of "the lusts," then incorporated in the text, and subsequent changes made to avoid confusion.

[2] Ver. 13.—[The idea of military service found in παριστάνετε is better expressed by *render*, since *yield* implies a previous resistance, not found in the Apostle's thought.

[3] Ver. 12.—[*To* is the better rendering of the simple datives here, as in ver. 19. *Unto* has a telic force, which makes it equivalent to *εἰς*. This distinction is preserved in ver. 19, but lost sight of by the English translators here.

[4] Ver. 13.—[*As being alive from the dead* (Amer. Bible Union) is a good version of ὡσεὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας; but the paraphrase of Alford: *as alive from having been dead*, conveys the full meaning. Still better is the Revision by Five Anglican Clergymen: *as those that were dead, and are alive.*

[5] Ver. 14.—[The article of the E. V. is not only unnecessary, since the Greek phrase is ὑπὸ νόμον, but perhaps incorrect; for the reference may be to "law" in general, rather than to "the (Mosaic) law." So in ver. 15.

[6] Ver. 15.—[The reading ἁμαρτήσομεν (*Rec.*) is weakly supported. ℵ. A. B. C. D. E. K. L., have ἁμαρτήσωμεν; adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, and others. This is the *deliberative* subjunctive; hence: "may we sin."

[7] Ver. 17.—[*Teaching* is preferable to *doctrine*. See *Exeg. Notes.*

[8] Ver. 17.—[*To which ye were delivered*, εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε, is literal, and corresponds with the figure implied in τύπον.—The full stop of the E. V. is unnecessary, as the next verse is closely connected with this one. The form of ver. 18 is altered, to make this connection more obvious.

[9] Ver. 19.—[Ἁγιασμόν may mean *holiness, Heiligkeit*, or *sanctification, Heiligung*. Bengel, however, discriminates between ἁγιότης and ἁγιασμός, the former "holiness," the latter "sanctification." See i. 4, p. 62, and *Exeg. Notes*, where Lange contends for the latter meaning here (against Meyer).

[10] Ver. 21.—[Lange adopts the punctuation of Lachmann, Griesbach, and many others, placing the interrogation after τότε, and making what follows the answer. A great array of authorities can be cited in support of each way of pointing, but this seems to give a better sense to καρπός. Comp. Alford *in loco*.

[11] Ver. 21.—[ℵ[3]. B. D. F[1]., Lachmann, Meyer, Alford, insert μέν before γάρ. Wordsworth does not insert it in his text, but favors it in his notes. It is omitted by ℵ[1]. A. C. D[3]. K. L. It seems more probable that it was carelessly omitted by some transcribers than inserted for any special reason.

[12] Ver. 23.—[The E. V. again loses the point of the closing phrase, by rendering ἐν, *through*. The life is emphatically *in Christ Jesus our Lord*. Hence perhaps Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 12. **Let not sin therefore reign** [Μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία]. The Apostle conducts the following discussion in a hortatory manner, but without actually "entering the sphere of exhortation," as Tholuck thinks. [The negative part of the exhortation, vers. 12, 13, corresponds to νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ver. 11; the positive part, ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε, ver. 13, answers to ζῶντας δὲ τῷ Θεῷ. So Meyer, Philippi, Alford, Hodge, &c.—P. S.] In a didactic respect he teaches that believers, by their transition from a state under the law to a state under grace, are first properly qualified and pledged to the service of righteousness, but are not free for the service of sin. That is, the true emancipation from outward legalism leads to an inward and free legalism, but not to Antinomianism. The οὖν indicates that ver. 11 shall be elaborated. But as the previous section has shown what is conformable to the *state of grace* in itself, the present section shows what is according to freedom from the hard service of sin, which was presupposed by bondage under the law. *Let not sin now reign* (imp.). The *true* sovereign command of grace is opposed to the *false* sovereign command of sin, which is still present as a broken power (Luther: Observe that holy people still have evil lusts in the flesh, which they do not follow). Tholuck: "Philippi and Meyer correctly remark, that the Apostle does not expressly make any concessions to the *concupiscentia* [ἐπιθυμίαις]; yet his admonition does not extend any farther than that lust must not become a deed. Sin is represented as ruler in the body, which ruler is served by the μέλη as organs." That is, however, as the one who *has been* the ruler; and the methods are at the same time given for destroying the lusts of the flesh, that they—by the life in the Spirit, which also changes the members into instruments of righteousness—should not only be continually ignored, but also annulled. [Alford, in opposition to Chrysostom, who lays stress on βασιλευέτω, says: "It is no matter of comparison between *reigning* and *indwelling merely*, but between *reigning* and *being deposed*."—P. S.]

In your mortal body [ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι]. The σῶμα as θνητόν must be distinguished, on the one hand, from the σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας of ver. 6, and, on the other, from the σῶμα νεκρόν of chap. viii. 10. The σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτ. is the pseudo-plastic apparent body of the old man, and, as the sensual side of all sinfulness, is devoted with it to destruction. The body is a σῶμα νεκρόν so far as it no more asserts itself as a second principle of life with, or even superior to, the principle of the Spirit, but yields itself purely to the service of the Spirit. But a σῶμα θνητόν is the body so far as it, as the sensual organism of the earthly existence, has living organs, which shall be purified from the former service of sin and transferred to the service of righteousness. The σῶμα as a false principle is destroyed; the σῶμα as a secondary principle is dead, absolutely helpless; and the σῶμα as the organ of the spiritual principle is transformed into instruments of righteousness. It is called *mortal*, because its earthly propensity is toward sin and death, and it must be compulsorily brought into the service of righteousness, and exercised as for a spiritual military service in antithesis to the body of the resurrection, which will be the pure power and excellence of righteousness. Meyer is therefore correct in rejecting the interpretation, that θνητόν is the same as νεκρόν (dead to sin; Turretin, Ernesti, and others).

But it may be asked, For what purpose is the adjective θνητόν?

1. Calvin: *per contemptum vocat mortale* [*ut doceat totam hominis naturam ad mortem et exitium inclinare*]. Köllner: It is dishonorable to make the spirit subject to this frail body.

2. Grotius: *De vita altera cogitandum, nec formidandos labores haud sane diuturnos.* [Chrysostom, Theodoret, Reiche, likewise suppose that the word reminds us of the other life, and of the shortness of the conflict.—P. S.]

3. Flatt: Reminder of the brevity of sensual pleasure. [Comp. Theophylact].

4. Meyer, obscurely: It is absurd to make sin reign in the mortal body, if the Christian is dead to sin and alive to God.

5. Philippi: To call to mind that the wages of sin is death. [Philippi takes σῶμα in opposition to πνεῦμα.]

6. Tholuck, with Bullinger and Calixtus: Because sensual enticements are regarded as inseparable from the present sensuous organism, &c.

[7. Photius, Turretin, Ernesti: θνητόν is figuratively = dead; *i. e.*, corrupt (in which sense νεκρός is often used).]

In all these definitions the relative dignity and estimate of the "mortal body," which are definitely declared in ver. 13, are not regarded; the same

members, which until then had been instruments of unrighteousness, henceforth being instruments of righteousness. The organism of earthly existence and action, which has become mortal by sin, is naturally an organism for the service of the spirit. By the dominion of sin in it, its mortality became still more intense; but by the normal subjection of sin to the service of the Spirit, it shall be brought with it on the course toward everlasting life (ver. 22).

That ye should obey the lusts thereof [εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ]. According to the sense, we must supply ὑμᾶς to ὑπακούειν. *To the end* that ye obey its lusts. Even if the body were holy, its impulses would have to be subject to the dominion of the spirit; much more must they be subject to the spirit, since they are diseased, irritable, excitable, and inclined to self-assertion and demoniacal self-distraction.

Ver. 13. **Nor render your members** [Μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν]. Without doubt παριστάνειν has reference here to enlistment or delivery for military service. The Apostle is writing to Rome, the metropolis of military affairs, and therefore derives his figure from Roman customs (comp. chap. xiii. 12); just as he admonishes the Corinthians by expressions that call up the Isthmian games (1 Cor. ix. 24), and speaks to the spiritual city of Ephesus concerning the battle with spirits (Eph. vi. 11, 12). Sin is already distinguished as the false βασιλεύς, who causes the false summons to be promulgated that the members shall be ordered into his warfare against righteousness.—**Your members.** If the body has ceased to be an independent principle, only its members come into consideration (in the good sense of the principle: *Divide et impera*). According to Erasmus, Philippi, and others, the intellectual forces and activities (perception, will, understanding) are included in the term. According to Meyer, only the physical members are meant (the tongue, hand, foot, eye, &c.), "for which, however, intellectual action is a necessary supposition. The physical members are plainly meant as organs and symbols of ethical conduct (different from the pseudoplasmatic members; Col. iii. 5).

As weapons [or **instruments**] **of unrighteousness** [ὅπλα ἀδικίας]. Meyer says, *of immorality*. But, in war, people contend for the right or the wrong; therefore the expression ἀδικία must be strictly retained.—"Ὅπλα, according to the Vulgate, Theodoret, Luther, Calvin, Bengel, and Meyer: weapons. Calixtus and De Wette [Stuart, Reiche, Hodge, Ewald, Alford], on the other hand: instruments. The former construction can by no means be favored by appealing to the fact that the βασιλεύειν suggests warriors in service, for the trope is already obliterated (?) in that term; but it is favored by the consideration that the Apostle also elsewhere—when he uses ὅπλα in the ethical sense—employs it in the meaning of 'weapons;' Rom. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 7; x. 4" (Tholuck). [Meyer insists that ὅπλα, while so frequently used in the sense of instruments by classical authors, is never thus used in the New Testament.—R.]

To sin [τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ]. Personified as the presumptively false ruler (see chap. v. 12 ff.).

But render yourselves [ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτούς]. We must observe here a double antithesis: first, *the aorist* παραστήσατε in opposition to the previous present, παριστάνετε; second, ἑαυτούς in connection with the following καὶ τὰ μέλη, in opposition to the previous τὰ μέλη. Both are quite in harmony with the antithesis. For believers have already fundamentally placed themselves as such in the service of righteousness, and in complete unity with the centre of their life, while the man in the opposite service of sin yields his members individually to a foreign power. At all events, the Christian, as the servant of sin, would be led into the contradiction of wishing to remain free himself while he placed his members at the service of sin. On the aorist παραστήσατε, comp. Winer, p. 293; and Tholuck, p. 311. (It denotes, "according to Fritzsche, what happens in the moment; according to Meyer, that which occurs forthwith; and according to Philippi, that which appears once;" Tholuck). Tholuck does not attach importance to the difference between the aorist imperative and the present imperative, since he concurs with those who disregard the temporal reference. We hold, with Herm. Schmidt (*De imperativis*; Wittenberg, 1833): "The imperative present commands *to occupy one's self with something*; the imperative aorist, *to accomplish something*." We add to this: That something already under consideration, or already undertaken, must be carried through. [The greater definiteness implied in the aorist must not be lost sight of, whatever view be adopted.—R.]

As being alive from the dead [ὡς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας. The ὡς does not introduce a figure, but means rather (comp. ver. 11): regarding yourselves *as* those who are alive, almost = *since* you are. The phrase is a condensed description of the state of ἑαυτούς. While the reference is undoubtedly ethical, *yourselves* must be taken in its widest meaning—body, soul, and spirit; and the implication is, that the whole man was once dead *in* sin (not *to* sin, as ver. 11), but now is alive; hence the pertinence of the exhortation. The reference to a field of battle is extremely doubtful, since it introduces a new figure so soon after vers. 2–11.—R.] Meyer: Those who, from dead persons, have become living. We assume the figure of a field of battle. The Christians lay there as dead or slain persons, and from dead persons they became alive; therefore they can and should go over to the banner of righteousness.

And your members [καὶ τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν. Hodge paraphrases *and:* and especially; but καὶ seems to have an inferential force here.—R.] Because they have become themselves the warriors of God, they must also regard their members as God's weapons, the weapons of righteousness for God.*

Ver. 14. **For sin shall not have dominion over you** [ἁμαρτία γὰρ ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει]. The future, according to Melanchthon: *dulcissima consolatio;* erroneously regarded by Rosenmüller, Flatt, and others, as imperative. If we were to distinguish between the expression of confident supposition (Calov. and De Wette) and consoling promise (Chrysostom, Grotius, and Tholuck), we would prefer the former meaning, since the predomi-

* [The German commentators generally take the second τῷ Θεῷ as *dat. commodi*, and render *für Gott*. They advance no special reason for it. This view unnecessarily disturbs the parallelism of the clauses, since the second τῷ Θεῷ is in strict verbal contrast with τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ. The first τῷ Θεῷ is undoubtedly the simple dative after παραστήσατε, but as the same verb must be supplied in this clause, it seems unnecessary to substitute any other regimen here. We render *to God* in both clauses; the more confidently, since the second clause is but a particularisation of the first, to carry out the antithesis. Comp. Stuart.—R.]

sant train of thought throughout is didactic; yet the latter is also included.

For ye are not under law [οὐ γάρ ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμον]. Notwithstanding the preceding declaration in chap. v. 20, the expression continues to be an oxymoron, since the law is recognized as a carrier to sin. The sense is: freedom from the law gives you so little freedom to sin, that it is only by the exercise of grace upon you that your freedom from sin has begun. [Meyer: "Were they *under the law*, Paul could not have given this promise (*i. e.*, in the preceding clause), for the law is the strength of sin (1 Cor. xv. 56), multiplies sin (v. 20), in which aspect he intends to explain it further in chap. vii." *Law* is here used in its widest signification. See Hodge.—R.]

Under *the dominion of* **grace** [ὑπὸ χάριν], which operates as an inward and new principle of life; while the law, as such, confronted the inward life only as an outward demand—threatening, arousing, and casting down; and in this form it presupposed the dominion of sin. Bondage under the law betokened bondage under sin, without being able to remove it; but it is removed by the dominion of grace, which has become an inward law of life. [The general idea undoubtedly is: "Ye are not under a *legal* dispensation, but a *gracious* one" (Stuart); yet the whole context forbids the exclusive reference to the method of justification. "Grace" is here used in its widest sense; "the Divine grace, shown in Christ, is the power under which ye stand" (Meyer), and which assures that ye shall not be under the dominion of sin.—"*Gratia non solum peccata diluit, sed ut non peccemus facit*" (Augustine).—R.]

Ver. 15. **What then? May we sin** [Τί οὖν; ἁμαρτήσωμεν. See *Textual Note* [a].—R.]. According to Rückert, Meyer, and others, a new section should commence here; which Tholuck is right in opposing. The unity of the following with the foregoing is the fundamental thought: freedom from sin. Also the reference to the members continues throughout what follows (ver. 19). There is, however, a modification. Down to ver. 14 the antithesis was rather an ethical demand; but now a religious confirmation predominates. There, the new life was contrasted with the old as a voluntary entrance into the *military service* of righteousness over against the wicked, mercenary service of sin; here, the Apostle (speaking according to human analogy) presents the obligation of a new *service* in contrast with the old *service*. In the present verse Paul therefore brings out prominently the fearful consequence of the impure Antinomian view of the state of grace, in order to condemn it forthwith. To this earnest rejection of a horrible consequence, arising so frequently in ancient and modern times, the conjunctive ἁμαρτήσωμεν corresponds better than the future. [Dr. Hodge well remarks: "Such has been the objection to the doctrines of grace in all ages. And the fact that this objection was made to Paul's teachings, proves that his doctrine is the same with that against which the same objection is still urged." This consideration should also prevent any limitation of "grace" to justification.—On μὴ γένοιτο, see iii. 4, *Textual Note* [a], p. 112; comp. *Comm. Gal.*, p. 49, foot-note.—R.]

Ver. 16. **To whom ye yield yourselves.** With the *know ye not*,* the Apostle points to the analogy of a principle of civil law; but he gives the application in the same sentence with it. To whom you once voluntarily gave and pledged yourselves for obedience [with a view to obedience; Alford] as servants (slaves), his servants ye are, and him ye obey; be it *as servants* of sin unto death, &c. Thus the two services preclude each other, since the masters deny each other (Matt. vi. 24). According to De Wette, Philippi, and Tholuck, the emphasis rests on ἐστε; according to Meyer, on δοῦλοι. But the actual *being and availing*, with its consequence, is plainly the principal idea here; the being servants is at the same time connected with it. The ᾧ ὑπακ. is explained by Reiche: *to whom you have to obey.* But this weakens the sense.

[**Either, or.** The disjunctive ἤτοι occurs only here in the New Testament. It lays special emphasis on the first alternative (Meyer). "Either this alone, or that; there is no third;" Hartung, ii. p. 356 f.—R.] The ἤτοι, ἤ, a strong *either, or.* Sin is personified here too. But the ὑπακοή is personified in opposition to it as the παρακοή (1 Peter i. 14); and this is a beautiful expression for the Christian's freedom in his obedience.* Plainly, the Apostle here makes the freedom of choice precede the *servum arbitrium;* according to ver. 17, the former was bound a long time ago.

Of sin unto death [ἁμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον.] According to Fritzsche and Reiche, physical death is meant; but according to Meyer and Tholuck (the early view of which latter was that it is spiritual death), after Chrysostom, eternal death is spoken of. Meyer's ground against the acceptance of physical death is, that it is not the consequence of individual sin, and cannot be averted from the δοῦλος ὑπακοῆς—an argument which Tholuck accepts. But how could this occur, if there were not in earthly life a hundred-fold gradations of physical death? The death of the suicide, for example, is not to be explained simply by the fall of Adam. And thus spiritual death has its degrees also. Therefore the Apostle speaks of death in general (so also Philippi); † as, according to 1 Cor. xv., his thorn is sin, which has eternal death in prospect. Even the forms of the misery of sin which precede death are not to be excluded.

Of obedience unto righteousness [ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην.] Meyer, just as incorrectly, presents the δικαιοσύνη as the *final result* for the servants of obedience, in contrast with exclusively eternal death. The righteousness of faith

* [Stuart: "I take it for granted that ye know and believe." Jowett paraphrases thus: "Know ye not that what ye make yourselves, ye are?" This view he takes to avoid tautology, yet this seems to depart from the Apostle's line of thought.—R.]

* [Forbes calls attention to the deviation from the strict parallelism in this verse: "of *obedience* unto *righteousness*," instead of "of *righteousness* unto *life*." He intimates that thus Paul marks this distinction: To *sin* we give ourselves of our own free choice and power as bondsmen, but we cannot of our own free choice, and by any effort of will, give ourselves to the service of righteousness; hence all we can do is to yield ourselves up to God's grace, to save us, as servants of *obedience*, for or unto righteousness, as a "gift" to be bestowed upon us, and inwrought into us by His Spirit. He also notices that the direct expression: *servants to righteousness* does not occur until ver. 19—the caution being attributable to anxiety lest such an expression be turned to legalistic account.—R.]

† [De Wette: "*Sündenelend überhaupt.*" So Alford: "The state of misery induced by sin, in all its awful aspects and consequences." The wider view is necessary, since the word occurs frequently, in the remainder of the chapter and in chap. vii., in such a connection that a limitation is unfortunate. Meyer's exegesis is hampered throughout by his view of θάνατος.—R.]

is certainly assumed here; but the "uprightness which is adjudged to believers in the judgment" is gradually developed to its completion from obedience as the form of the new life.* (On the construction of this verse with vers. 17, 18 [Rückert and Reiche], by which ver. 16 is the *propositio major*, ver. 17 the *minor*, and ver. 18 the conclusion. Comp. Tholuck.)†

Ver. 17. **But thanks to God**, &c. [χάρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, κ.τ.λ.]. It may be asked, whether the first proposition is a mere introduction to the second as the principal proposition, so that the thanksgiving refers merely to obedience (Grotius, Estius, and others); or whether the thanksgiving refers to both propositions (Meyer, Tholuck).‡ Tholuck says, in favor of the latter view: "Since ἦτε precedes, and μὲν is wanting, ἦτε must be read with all the more emphasis; as 1 Cor. vi. 11: καὶ ταῦτα τινες ἦτε; Eph. v. 8: ἦτε γάρ ποτε σκότος; and the immediate object of thanksgiving is that this time of the bondage to sin is past." Evidently, the deliverance from the service of death is in itself already a satisfactory ground for praise and thanksgiving; yea, we naturally thank God for this with the greatest emotion (God be praised: delivered!), although this negative side of salvation cannot be regarded as separate from the positive.

But ye obeyed from the heart [ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας]. They were only conditionally voluntary in their bondage to sin; but they have become obedient from the very bottom of their heart.

That form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered [εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς]. The simplest solution of the attraction εἰς ὃν παρεδ. is τῷ τύπῳ τῆς διδαχ., εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε.§ Explanations:

1. Christian doctrine in general (the most common). Meyer says properly to the contrary: By this the expression τύπος would not be explained. Beza, indeed, explains it: A seal under which we are placed to receive its impression.‖

2. The doctrinal form of the gospel according to Paul, in opposition to anti-Paulinism (De Wette, Meyer, and others).¶

3. Œcumenius, Calvin, and others, have taken the word in the sense of the ideal which the doctrine holds up. For a still more untenable explanation by Van Hengel, see Meyer.

Tholuck first repudiates the presumption of anti-Paulinism. Yet it does, indeed, come into consideration, so far as it judaistically obscured the Pauline doctrine of free grace. Tholuck is then inclined to accept the explanation of Beza, and says "that it is by no means a common expression 'to be delivered to a doctrine,' even if, with Chrysostom and Olshausen, we consider at the same time the guidance of God as the active factor." But the Apostle says, in Gal. i. 6, what he holds concerning this type of doctrine in opposition to its obscurations.

God himself has committed them to this school of faith.

Παρεδόθητε is not middle (Fritzsche), but passive. [Winer, p. 245, seems to justify the change to the active form which the E. V. adopts, but there is a good reason for the choice of the passive, viz., the activity of God in committing them to this type of teaching. This thought appropriately follows "Thanks to God." So Meyer, comp. Philippi.—R.] It follows, from what has been said, that the Church was already won over by the Apostle's friends to the Pauline form of the gospel. But here the matter treated of is the essential element; the true energy of freedom from the law is the true energy of life in obedience unto righteousness.

Ver. 18. **And being made free from sin** [ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. Aorist participle, referring to the definite act of deliverance. The clause stands in close connection with ver. 17, not as a conclusion (since οὖν would occur in that case), but rather as an expansion.—R.]. The δέ leads us to emphasize the expression: ye are enslaved, or made servants, &c. From the nature of the case, they knew the negative past—*free from sin*—earlier and better than this full consequence: **ye became the servants of righteousness.**

Ver. 19. **I speak after the manner of men.** The ἀνθρώπινον is analogous to the κατ' ἄνθρωπον in chap. iii. 5.* By slavery, which was in full bloom in Rome, the Apostle clearly explains to them the absolute force of the new principle of life.

Because of the infirmity of your flesh [διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν]. The flesh, or the sensuous and susceptible fulness of the body, is not only negatively weak, but also positively diseased and disturbed, both of which facts are expressed by the ἀσθένεια. It may be asked, however, whether the Apostle means here the weakness of intelligence arising from this infirmity, by which he was compelled to represent to them the highest liberty under the figure of servitude (Bengel, Meyer, and De Wette, with reference to 1 Cor. iii. 1); or whether he meant their practical infirmity. The first view—that is, the reference to intelligence—appears also in the intimation that the Apostle announces a popular explanation (Vatable, Ernesti, and Rosenmüller). The latter view is favored by Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Calvin, &c.: "I require nothing which your fleshly weakness could not do," or the like. The thought here could not be unintelligible to the Roman Christians; therefore the practical reference by all means preponderates; but not in the sense already given: "I require of you nothing too difficult; I require only the degree of obedience which you formerly rendered to sin."

* [Prof. Stuart here also confounds δικαιοσύνη with δικαίωσις, and unfortunately paraphrases: *obedience which is unto justification*. This is open to lexical as well as theological objections. Δικ. is subjective (Hodge).—R.]

† [Tholuck agrees with Meyer, who takes ver. 16 as the *major*, ver. 17 as the *minor*, but regards the *conclusion* as self-evident, and hence not expressed.—R.]

‡ [So Philippi, Hodge, Alford, and modern commentators generally, taking the first clause as meaning: *that it is over*. Wordsworth, however, finds here "a mode of speaking, where a bad thing is represented as comparatively good, so that the superiority of what is contrasted with it may appear more clear." This seems totally irrelevant.—R.]

§ [Stuart prefers to find no attraction, since ὑπακούειν governs the accusative, but there seems to be a modification of the meaning in such cases. On the grammatical difficulty, see Meyer *in loco*, Winer, p. 155.—R.]

‖ [Wordsworth thus carries out the metaphor of the verse: "You readily obeyed the mould of Christian Faith and Practice, into which, at your baptism, you were poured, as it were, like soft, ductile and fluent metal, in order to be cast, and take its form. You obeyed this mould; you were not rigid and obstinate, but were plastic and pliant, and assumed it readily."—R.]

¶ [Adopting this view in the main, we prefer *teaching* to *doctrine*. The latter is more abstract, but the reference here seems to be to definite forms of instruction.—R.]

* [Hodge: "The former characterizes as human the thing said, and the other the manner of saying it." Comp. Meyer, however.—This apologetic form of expression concerns the description of "true freedom" as a δουλεία.—R.

The Apostle's thought can rather be explained by what follows: "Yield your members *servants*," &c. That is, even if, in your spiritual life, you feel that you are as freemen, you must nevertheless restrain your members strictly in discipline and obedience on account of the infirmity of your flesh. With all freedom, the question in reference to the bodily members is an appropriate ascetic discipline, such as the Apostle exercised in reference to his own body (1 Cor. ix. 27; comp. Gal. v. 24); and therefore the figurative form of his expression does not merely correspond to the antithesis as denoting an unlimited obedience, but is established in a more special sense as the requirement of a strict discipline. This view obviates Meyer's reminder: λέγω cannot mean *require*. The Apostle does not express a requirement, but a principle; by which analogy the Christian, in his freedom, has to make his bodily life absolutely subject. Lachmann [apparently Olshausen] and Fritzsche unjustifiably make a parenthesis of this clause, ἀνθρώπινον, κ.τ.λ.

[With Bengel, Olshausen, De Wette, Hodge, Alford, and many others, I am disposed to give a decided preference to the first view, viz., that this clause refers to what precedes. Commentators differ as to the force of the terms, but the following positions seem most tenable. *Infirmity* means *intellectual* weakness, growing out of their carnal condition (σάρκος, *gen. auctoris*). The ethical reference is in σάρξ, not in ἀσθένεια. On σάρξ, see chap. vii.—R.]

For as ye have rendered your members [ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν. Γάρ is *explicative* (Tholuck, Meyer). Δοῦλα, used as an adjective, only here in New Testament (Hodge).—R.] To servitude. The apparently free pleasure was, in fact, a hard bondage under sin.—**To uncleanness** [τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ.] We hold that ἀκαθαρσία has especial reference to the heathen portion (according to chap. i.), and **to iniquity**, ἀνομία, on the contrary, to the Jewish portion (according to chap. ii.). Meyer makes this distinction: ἀκαθ. is sin as ethically defiling man; and ἀνομ. is sin as violation of the Divine law. Spener, De Wette, and others, distinguish thus: Uncleanness as defilement of themselves and of sin toward others. Tholuck considers ἀκαθ. as *species*, and ἀνομία as the generalizing genus of sin. But the genus is declared in what follows. The ἀκαθ., or fleshly sin in the narrower sense, and the ἀνομία, or violations of the law in the narrower sense, converge in the ἀνομία in the wider sense in guilt and condemnation before the law—which constitute the antithesis to ἁγιασμός. Therefore the explanation of **unto iniquity**,* εἰς τὴν ἀνομ., as from one sin to others, is incorrect (Œcumenius, Erasmus, Luther, and Grotius). The duality of the service of sin is worthy of note: a service in part to uncleanness and in part to insubordination. This could not be the case (according to the axiom that no man can serve two masters) if both were not connected.

Even so now render your members as servants to righteousness unto sanctification [οὕτως νῦν παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν.] Righteousness, as the new principle of life, should bear unconditional sway over the members; holiness should be the end and result. Meyer translates ἁγιασμός, *holiness*. To *present holiness*. Even Tholuck does not understand the word to mean an effort to be holy. He refers to ver. 22; but there ἁγιασμός is still distinct from the τέλος as movement toward the τέλος. He then quotes Heb. xii. 1–4. But this passage does not decide positively for the expression *holiness*. For completed holiness is not the preliminary condition for beholding the Lord, but its fruit. But, according to this very passage, ἁγιασμός cannot mean a striving; otherwise we would have to translate: strive after the striving of holiness. The expressions quoted by Tholuck from Basil and Œcumenius do not both prove the same thing. Œcumenius understands by the word, absolute purity; Basil, thorough consecration to the holy God. And this is the sense. Ἁγιασμός means, first of all, the act of consecration ("According to Bleek, on Heb. xii. 14, it does not occur among the classics; but Dion. Halic., i. 21, as in the Sept., has it of acts of consecration;" Tholuck), then the condition of being consecrated, or of holiness—an idea which does not perfectly coincide with the idea of completed holiness, and in which there is at once expressed the constant ethical movement, rather than a substantial and quiescent condition.

[On the lexical grounds Lange advances, *sanctification* is the preferable meaning—one which accords with the context. The issue (not, the end; the use of the phrase in ver. 22 is against this) is sanctification, which indeed results in perfect holiness, but comes into view here rather as a progressive state than as an ultimate one. Undoubtedly *righteousness* describes the principle, and ἁγι. the actual condition (Philippi), but in the sense given by Lange above. Meyer says the word always means *holiness*—never *sanctification*—in the New Testament. Compare, on the contrary, Bengel, Rom. i. 4.—R.]

Ver. 20. **For when ye were servants of sin** [ὅτε γὰρ δοῦλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρτίας]. According to Fritzsche, the γάρ indicates the elucidation of ver. 19; but according to Meyer and Tholuck, it announces the establishing of it. It is, however, rather a continued elucidation of the preceding than an establishment of what follows.* The Apostle answers the question: wherefore should the service of righteousness be a bond-service? Answer: because ye, who were formerly the servants of sin, became free in relation to righteousness. They were not the freemen of righteousness, as though it had made them free, but in relation to it; therefore the dative. The argument lies in the necessity of the complete reversion of the earlier relation. Since sin and righteousness preclude each other, they were free in relation to righteousness, because they were the bondmen of sin. Therefore, since they have now become free from sin, they

* [A question arises as to the exact meaning of the phrase εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν. It may mean, for the purpose of iniquity—*i. e.*, in order to work iniquity (Stuart, Hodge, Meyer), in order that this shall be actually presented, or issuing in iniquity, ἐν. indicating the resultant state (Tholuck, De Wette, Alford, Lange). The latter is preferable, because the word seems to refer to a state rather than an act. Besides, its antithesis is εἰς ἁγιασμόν, which indicates the result, as we infer from its use in ver. 22.—R.]

* [The difficult connection of the verse is satisfactorily explained in Webster and Wilkinson: "γάρ restates the view given of their former condition in respect to sin and righteousness, in preparation for the final and most accurate statement of their present spiritual condition (ver 22)." Meyer (who has changed his views), in 4th ed., also finds in this verse a preparation for the full statement of a *motive* for obeying the precept of ver. 19. He groups vers. 20–22 as one in thought, calling attention, however, to the somewhat tragical force of our verse, with its emphatic words in the parallel clauses.—R.]

must be the bondmen of righteousness. The fearful expression, **free as regards righteousness** [ἐλεύθεροι ἦτε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, dative of reference], does not mean that righteousness had no claims upon you (Tholuck), but that it had no part in you.* According to Koppe and Reiche, this is ironical; a position opposed by Meyer, and now also by Tholuck. There is certainly nothing ironical in the sentence, but there is in the word ἐλεύθεροι. For we can no more accept it in a strict sense, than that they should be the slaves of righteousness. As this latter bondage is not only freedom, but also spontaneity, so was that freedom the deepest slavery. [That was a sorrowful freedom! Why find irony, then?—R.]

Ver. 21. **What fruit had ye then therefore? Things whereof ye are now ashamed** [τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἴχετε τότε; ἐφ' οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε. See *Textual Note* [10].—R.]. Here are two divergent constructions:

1. The question closes with τότε. Then follows the answer. (Thus the Pesh., Theodore of Mopsvestia, Theodoret, Erasmus, Luther, and many others, down to De Wette, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Philippi.) [So Alford, Webster and Wilkinson.]

2. The question continues to ἐπαισχύνεσθε. What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? Answer: None; for the final result of them (these things) is death (thus Chrysostom, Œcumenius, Beza, Calov., Grotius, &c.; Bengel, Meyer). [So Stuart, Hodge, Wordsworth.]

3. Reiche, in conjunction with the latter construction, explains thus: What deeds, of which ye are now ashamed, proceeded from your service of sin (namely, your bringing forth fruit)? This third construction is utterly untenable; καρπός would then recur as plural in ἐφ' οἷς, and καρπ. ἔχειν would mean: to bring forth fruit.

There are the following reasons against Meyer's explanation: 1. First of all, he must insert an ἐκείνων before ἐφ' οἷς, and introduce a negation into the question, in order to explain the form of the answer, τὸ γάρ, &c. 2. The question is, What fruit had ye then? not, What will ye have finally? 3. After the antithesis, it should be made emphatic that they had formerly no fruit, but rather pernicious and horrible deceptions, but that now they bring forth their fruit. 4. By Meyer's construction, ἐφ' οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε would be converted into an enervating remark. Meyer says, against explanation No. 1: 1. According to ver. 22, the question, in antithesis to ver. 21, is the *having* the fruit, and not the quality of it. This is wrong: the καρπός is qualified, εἰς ἁγιασμόν. 2. Paul must have written τίνας καρπούς, or ἐφ' ᾧ; as if the metaphorical idea of fruit, or gain, could not be represented in a variety of things. 3. Paul never ascribes καρποί to immorality; he attributes ἔργα to it (Gal. v. 19); he predicates καρπός of only what is good (Gal. v. 22; Eph. v. 9; Phil. i. 11); indeed, he even designates the ἔργα τοῦ σκότους as ἄκαρπα. But the Apostle says the same thing here, when he asks, What fruit had ye then? He even denies that they had real fruit—the true gain of life. On the other hand, they reaped, instead of true fruit, base deceptions, things of which they are now ashamed, and in which their future death is announced. Comp. Gal. vi. 8. Tholuck thinks that between the two constructions there is no demonstrative decision.

For the end of those things is death [τὸ μὲν γὰρ τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος]. Death must be understood here in its complete and comprehensive meaning; not eternal death exclusively (Meyer).

Meyer, with Lachmann, accepts μέν, and translates: for the end is indeed death; but without observing that this contradicts his own construction of the passage. It is only on the first construction that μέν has any meaning. [See *Textual Note* [11]. Having already accepted μέν on diplomatic and critical grounds, before carefully considering the exegetical results, I am now disposed to insist upon retaining it, and using it as decisive in regard to the construction of the verse.—R.]

Ver. 22. **But now having been made free from sin** [νυνὶ δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας]. The evil relation has been completely reversed by faith.—**And become servants to God** [δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ θεῷ. Notice the definiteness of the aorist participles.—R.]. God himself here takes the place of δικαιοσύνη, for their relation is now one of personal love.—**Ye have your fruit unto sanctification** [ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν. The present indicates fruit already. The sense: *have your reward*, seems unjustifiable here. Εἰς is consecutive here (Meyer), as I hold it to be in ver. 19 also. Ἁγιασμόν, *sanctification*, as above, a progressive state, the immediate issue of the fruit of their personal relation to God, the final issue follows.—R.] They have fruit already in this new relation. Meyer: the καινότης ζωῆς, ver. 4.—Or the *peace*, chap. v. 1. But as, in the Old Testament, the firstlings served for the ἁγιασμός, so, in the New Testament, this is done by the whole fruit of the life of faith. Tholuck translates here also: *holiness* [without excluding the idea of sanctification, however.—R.]

And the end everlasting life [τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώνιον]. That is, ye have everlasting life. Meyer says, this possession is still an ideal one. It is rather an essential one; John iii. 36; Matt. v. 8; Heb. xii. 14; 1 John iii. 2. [We must take "life" here in its most extended sense, as "death" in ver. 21. Meyer's difficulty arises from his limiting the meaning of these two words throughout. We have already eternal life in germ; in its fulness it is the τέλος of all our fruit and fruitfulness. Not, however, by natural, inherent laws of development. The next verse sets forth anew the two ends, and the inherent difference.—R.]

Ver. 23. **For the wages of sin is death** [τὰ γὰρ ὀψώνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας θάνατος]. Tholuck: "Ὀψώνιον, and in the plural ὀψώνια, wages of the servant and the soldier; therefore possibly, though not necessarily, a continuation of the figure of military service; comp. ὅπλα, ver. 13. Under this supposition, Grotius, Bengel, and Wetstein made χάρισμα to mean the *donationum militare*. Yet the technical word for such a gift is ἡ ἐπίδοσις (Fritzsche)." The figurative character of the antithesis lies in the fact that sin pays its soldiers and slaves miserable wages (Erasmus: ὀψώνια, *vile verbum*), namely, *death;* but God (as King) pays His children and servants, not a reward, but the honor-gift of His favor, which is eternal life. Tholuck defines the antithesis thus: as far as sin is concerned, her due is according to justice; but, on the other hand, what is received by the believing account

* [Stuart: "counted yourselves free." This is an implied irony, and objectionable, for it is not strictly true.—R.]

ance of God's saving blessings can be regarded only as a gift—namely, the imparting of salvation, the eternal completion of life. This antithesis is correct so far as it is not pushed beyond the proper measure, so that justice does not appear as mere arbitrary authority. In the present passage, however, this antithesis recedes; for the question is not concerning the righteous punishment of sin, but the way in which sin itself, regarded as false dominion, pays the reward. The gift of God also, at all events, presupposes the merit of believers, but yet remains a gift, because the whole idea of gain falls to the ground where merit is not considered, and where even the preliminary conditions of good conduct are bestowed as a gift.* For the idea of wages, see 1 Cor. ix. 7. "The plural (more usual than the singular) may be explained from the manifold elements of original natural reward, and from the numerous coins of later money-wages;" Meyer.

In Christ Jesus our Lord [ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. Stuart follows the inexact sense of the E. V.: "through the redemption or atonement of Christ." True; but not what Paul says here. *In Christ Jesus* is an expression which has a full, rich meaning of its own. In this case, we may ask whether the phrase limits *God*, or *gift of God*, or is used more generally. Meyer says: in Christ it rests, is causally founded, that the gift of God is eternal life. Webster and Wilkinson: "in Him, by virtue of His relation to Deity, God is the giver; in Him, we, as united with Him, having an interest in Him, are recipients.—R.]. He is not only the source, but also the central treasure of our eternal life.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. It is certainly not accidental that the word *to rule*, βασιλεύειν, occurs so frequently in the Epistle to the Romans (chap. v. 14, 17, 21; vi. 12); likewise the word *weapons*, ὅπλα, here, and in chap. xiii. 12. See the *Exeg. Notes*, where reference is made to the Apostle's similar allusions to local relations in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, as well as in the Epistle to the Ephesians. His epistles in general abound in these evidences of truth to life. In the Epistle to the Galatians, for example, we see very plainly the Galatian fickleness; in the Epistles to the Corinthians, we see the city of Corinth portrayed; and in the Epistle to the Colossians, the Phrygian popular spirit, &c. Such evidences of authenticity are regarded by the critics of Baur's school as mere cobwebs, while they convert cobwebs of the barest probability into important and decisive evidence.

2. In this section the Apostle passes from the figure of military service to that of servitude, in order to portray, in every relation, Christian freedom in its contrast with the bondage of man in sin.

3. On ver. 12. The despotic dominion of sin in the mortal body of the unregenerate, is an ethical copy of physical demoniacal possession. Sin, as a foreign force, has penetrated the individual life, and riots there as lord and master. Christianity now consists essentially in raising the shield of the Spirit against this usurping despotism, in the power of the triumph, dominion, and fellowship of Christ.

4. Ver. 13. If the real Christian should again serve sin, his conduct would be a voluntary, cowardly, and inexcusable surrender of his arms to a hostile power already overthrown. But, according to the Apostle's view, the whole life of humanity is a moral struggle of the spirit between righteousness and unrighteousness, in which all the human members are arms that contend for either righteousness or unrighteousness. Man, physiologically regarded, is born naked, without weapons or arms; ethically considered, he is "armed to the teeth;" his members have throughout the significance of moral arms.

5. The conclusion made by non-legal impurity, that sin is made free, because we are not under law, but under grace, is reversed by Paul, who says that, for this reason, sin is to be regarded as abrogated and excluded. The law does not make sinners, but it suits sinners; bondage under the law corresponds to bondage under sin, and the law cannot annul this bondage. To him who stands under the law, his own inmost nature is still a strange form; for the inmost nature, in its living character, signifies the inwardness of the law, freedom from the letter of the law, liberty. To be estranged from one's self is, therefore, to be still in the bondage of sin, and therefore under that of the law also, as the foreign form of the inmost norms of life. But in grace, man has become at once free from sin and the law, because by grace he has come to himself (Luke xv. 15), and because it has written the law, as the word of the Spirit, on his heart.* On the power of sin, see Tholuck, p. 313; on the *nova obedientia*, p. 314.

6. On ver. 16. Life is throughout a consequence of an established principle, either for death or for life, whether man may have made this principle—his self-determination—more or less clear to himself. Christianity is a thoroughly synthetical view of life—a view of life in its grand, complete, and fundamental relations. Adam, Christ—the state of bondage, the state of freedom, &c.

7. On ver. 17. When the Apostle thanks God that the Romans have not merely become Christians in a general sense, but have become obedient to the doctrinal form of the freedom of the gospel from the law, the application of this to the evangelical confession lies very near. The Apostle speaks here of definite doctrinal types, not so much in the formal as in the material sense. The antithesis is judaizing Christianity.

8. On vers. 19, 20. That the members should be servants to righteousness, is not merely a figurative expression arising from the antithesis that they were enslaved to sin. Rather, this is a demand which follows from the fact that, in consequence of serving sin, they are afflicted with weakness of the flesh; and therefore, notwithstanding the freedom of the Christian spirit—yea, by virtue of it—the morbid and blunted natural forces, the animal na-

* [On χάρισμα, see v. 15 ff.—The antithesis is different here, yet related—there, fall, transgression; here, *wages*, but *of sin*.—R.]

* [Stuart: "Christians are placed in a condition of which *grace* is the prominent feature: grace to sanctify as well as grace to renew the heart; grace to purify the evil affections; grace to forgive offences though often repeated, and thus to save from despair, and to excite to new efforts of obedience. Viewed in this light, there is abundant reason for asserting that Christians, under a system of grace will much more effectually throw off the dominion of sin, than they would do if under a mere law dispensation." Yet, if there be one point where there is most obscurity in the minds of the majority of professing Christians, it is here. That it has largely arisen from an obscuration of the doctrine of sanctification by grace, or rather the unwise sundering of justification and sanctification in discussing this Epistle, is painfully true.—R.]

tures, must be subjected, watched over, and controlled. Augustine teaches that the little tree, which has grown crooked on one side, is thereby stretched so that it can be bent a little toward the other side.

9. The *fruit* of the service of sin is first of all represented in bitter disappointments, confusion, disgrace, and shame; finally, in death. The reward of sin is, from its very nature, the low wages for slavish or military service, and in addition to this, further contemptible pay, viz., death. How glorious does the honorable gift of eternal life appear in comparison with this wretched reward! See the *Exeg. Notes.* We must here reject the exaggerations of the idea of gracious retribution, as well on the side of arbitrary authority as on the side of reward. In human relations, gain is a lower form than merit; but the donation goes far beyond the merit, since it, as the gift of personal magnanimity, will more than outweigh the work of personal worth. Everywhere in the kingdom of love, to say nothing of the kingdom of grace, all idea of merit falls to the ground; but the appropriateness of the reward to the dignity of the child and the worthiness of the servant, which are bestowed by God and religiously and morally appropriated, do not fall to the ground. Grace is not thereby so glorified that it is absolved from justice.* On the ζωὴ αἰώνιος, see Comm. on the Gospel of John, iii. 15.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The well-established apostolical admonition to a moral course of life: 1. To whom is it directed? 2. What does it require? 3. By what is it established?—Our body is mortal (ver. 12).—In whose service should our members be? 1. Not in the service of unrighteousness; but, 2. In the servce of righteousness (ver. 13).—In which service do our weapons hold out better? 1. Many believe in the service of unrighteousness; but there they are destroyed; 2. Christian experience teaches, on the other hand, that it is in the service of righteousness, for there they remain untouched (ver. 13).—Under the law there is death, but under grace there is life (ver. 14).—Law and grace.

Should we sin, since we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid! Because freedom from the law is (1.) not lawlessness, but (2.) obedience to righteousness [comp. Luther's work on the Freedom of a Christian Man], (vers. 15–23).—What is it to be obedient in heart to the form of doctrine with which we are connected? 1. Not only to be orthodox, but also believing (ver. 17).—The form of apostolical doctrine. 1. What must we understand thereby? (The Apostle Paul's doctrine of justification by faith.) 2. How far is this form of importance for us? (ver. 17).—Christian preachers should never forget to so speak after the manner of men that everybody can understand, chap. iii. 5 (ver. 19).—The fruits of serving sin and serving God: 1. The fruit of the former is death; 2. The fruit of the latter is eternal life (ver. 21).—What is the fruit of sin? 1. A fruit of which one must be ashamed; 2. One whose end is death (ver. 21).—What is the fruit of righteousness? 1. One of holiness; 2. One whose end is eternal life.—The precious fruit of holiness. It is not only to be regarded as (1.) lovely, but (2.) it makes wise, and joyous, and blessed (vers. 21, 22).—Death, and eternal life. 1. The former is the wages of sin; the latter is God's gift in Jesus Christ our Lord.

LUTHER: *In His death*, that even we should die like Him. Observe that believers have still wicked lusts in the flesh, which they do not obey (ver. 12).—So long as grace rules, the conscience remains free and controls sin in the flesh; but without grace, sin rules, and the law condemns the conscience (ver. 14).

STARKE: Sin still arises even in the regenerate, and they can again fall under its dominion; therefore they need the warning (ver. 12).—The pious are never without law, and yet not under the law, but in it (ver. 14).—Whoever still permits sin to rule over him, cannot be under grace (ver. 14).—To be a servant of sin, is the greatest misery; but to have been a servant of sin is the greatest blessedness (ver. 17).—Justification impels, moves, and powerfully awakens toward the exercise of godliness; Ps. cxxx. 5 (ver. 18).

HEDINGER: To have piety from compulsion, fear, or politeness, in order to please others, or through one's own inclination, desire, praise, and advantage, was the delusion and bondage of Ishmael. The children of God are not under the law; 1 John iv. 18 (ver. 15).—Christians are not libertines, who can do what they please: they are servants, but servants of God! But where are such servants? How great is their number? Servants of court, fashion, passion, men, the state, self, and the devil, can be seen in abundance.

CRAMER: We shall never have a better fate than Paul, all of whose words have been perverted, misinterpreted, and made sinful.—Nothing is more becoming in a servant than obedience. Because we are now the servants of God, we must be steadfastly obedient from the heart until the end, according to God's word, and not according to our own notion (ver. 16).—QUESNEL: As the heart is, so is the use of the body. He serves the Lord who has chosen Him from the heart. A true Christian dedicates himself wholly to God, his heart by love, and his body by good works (ver. 13).—O blessed servitude with which we serve God! The service of men makes miserable people; but the service of God makes us saints in time and kings in eternity; Isa. xiv. 3 (ver. 22).—MÜLLER: God will have no compulsory service; a willing heart is the best offering; in the weak flesh a willing spirit, in the small work a great will; Ps. cx. 3 (ver. 19).—He who is free from righteousness has no part in Christ (ver. 20).—As the fruit grows from the seed, so does ignominy grow from sin, outwardly before the world and inwardly in the conscience before God (see ver. 21).

SPENER: Earnest and true Christianity consists herein: although sin is present, it does not reign (ver. 12).—We dare not think, that though the wages of sin is death, Christ has redeemed us from death, so that it will not finally injure us. For the redemption wrought by Christ will not help us any, if we do not become obedient to Him (ver. 23).

GERLACH: The body, with its impulses and members, is like a house full of arms or implements, for war or every kind of labor. In the service of sin, these members, the sinful impulses then become themselves members unto sin (ver. 13).—The servitude of obedience is also true freedom (ver. 17).—Since, by the gospel, man becomes a servant as well as a freeman, license is just as much excluded as

* [It is well to note here the saying of Augustine: *Gratia non erit gratia ullo modo, nisi sit gratuita omni modo;* "Grace is not grace in any sort, if it be not free in every sort.—R.]

slavish obedience to a foreign power (ver. 18).—If righteousness, so rules in us that all our members become its instruments, they will work together for the increase of our holiness (ver. 19).—A single glance at the fruit and the reward of sin must fill the Christian with shame, and therefore with abhorrence of the false freedom which abuses grace (ver. 21).—The perfect sanctification of man in body and soul is also his true, eternal life; for by the perfect communion of his whole nature with the Fountain of all life, God himself pervades him spiritually and bodily with the fulness of everlasting life (ver. 22).

LISCO: Earnest admonition to holiness of life (vers. 12-23): 1. Its import (vers. 12-14); 2. The impulse to a more zealous sanctification is the grace of redemption (vers. 15-23).

HEUBNER: Freedom from the law is not liberty to sin, or lawlessness (ver. 15).—In Christianity, the law of the letter, with its worldly power, does not rule, but the free law of love (ver. 15).—Obedience, the practice of God's will, awakens in us increasingly the spiritual power of life, and obtains spiritual health (ver. 16).—Purity and beauty of soul arise only from sinlessness (ver. 19).—The remembrance of earlier sins never becomes wholly effaced, but, 1. It keeps the converted person humble and watchful; it awakens, 2. thankfulness for the love and grace of God; 3. sympathy for others.

BESSER: Believers are servants of righteousness (vers. 12-23).—Unrighteousness is a tyrannical master, who does not release his slaves according to their pleasure, but drives them ever farther from God's commandments (ver. 19).—*Serv tium Dei summa libertas* (ver. 19.)—The wages of sin is as manifold as the wages with which a general rewards his soldiers (bread, clothing, money); but its sum is death, empty death.

LANGE: The service of sin, at first apparently a voluntary life of warfare, but afterwards plainly a mercenary condition, and finally a state of slavery.—The fearful self-deception in surrendering one's self to sin: 1. At the outset, slavery instead of freedom; 2. In continuance, always backward instead of forward; 3. Finally, death instead of life.—Voluntary return to bondage is the deepest guilt of sin.—Real death is explained by its opposite. It is not contrasted with the present, but with eternal life.—Eternal life as the fruit of the true service of God in righteousness: 1. As redemption; 2. As gift.

[TILLOTSON: Sin is the blindness of our minds, the perverseness and crookedness of our wills, and the monstrous irregularity and disorder of our affections and appetites, the misplacing of our powers and faculties, and the setting of our wills and passions above our reason; all which is ugly and unnatural; and, if we were truly sensible of it, a matter of great shame and reproach to us.—BURKITT: Sin, as a raging and commanding king, has the sinner's heart for its throne, the members of the body for its service, the world, the flesh, and the devil for its grand council, lusts and temptations for its weapons and armory; and its fortifications are ignorance, sensuality, and fleshly reasonings.—Death, as the punishment of sin, is the end of the work, though not the end of the worker.—GROTIUS: It is the nature of all vices to grow upon a person by repetition.—CLARKE: Let God have your hearts, and, with them, your heads, your hands, and your feet. Think and devise what is pure; speak what is true, edifying, just, and good; and walk steadily in the way that leads to everlasting felicity.—Every sinner has a daily pay, and this pay is death.—The sinner has a hell in his own bosom; all is confusion and disorder where God does not reign. If men were as much in earnest to get their souls saved as they are to prepare them for perdition, heaven would be highly peopled; and devils would have to be their own companions.—HODGE: The motive to obedience is now love, and its aim the glory of God.—When a man is the slave of sin, he commonly thinks himself free; and, when most degraded, is often the most proud. When truly free, he feels himself most strongly bound to God, and when most elevated, is most humble.—J. F. H.]

FOURTH SECTION.—*The transition, in principle and reality, of Christians from the service of the letter under the law into the service of the Spirit under grace, by virtue of the death of Christ. Believers should live in the consciousness that they are dead to the law.*—THOLUCK: "*Your marriage with Christ, having taken the place of the dominion of the law, necessarily leads to such a dominion of God in a new life.*"

CHAP. VII. 1-6.

1 Know ye not, brethren (for I speak to them that [those who] know the
law), how [*omit* how] that the law hath dominion over a man as long [ἐφ' ὅσον
2 χρόνον, for as long time] as he liveth? For the woman which hath a husband [the married woman][1] is bound by the law to *her* husband so long as
he liveth [to the living husband]; but if the husband be dead [have died],[2] she
3 is loosed from the law of *her* husband. So then if, while *her* husband liveth,
she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if
her husband be dead [have died], she is free from that law; so that she is
4 no [not an][3] adulteress, though she be married to another man. Wherefore
[Accordingly], my brethren, ye also are become [were made][4] dead to the law by
[through] the body of Christ; [,] that [in order that][5] ye should be married to
another, *even* to him who is [was] raised from the dead, that we should bring

5 forth fruit unto [to][6] God. For when we were in the flesh, the motions [passions][7] of sins, which were by [by means of] the law, did work [ἐνηργεῖτο, were
6 *efficient*, wrought] in our members to bring forth fruit unto [to] death. But
now we are [have been] delivered from the law, that being dead [having died to
that][8] wherein we were held; that we should serve [so that we serve][9] in newness of spirit [the Spirit],[10] and not *in* the oldness of the letter.

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 2.—[The E. V. renders ὕπανδρος: *which hath a husband;* which is less forcible than the single word *married*. It is true that neither renderings convey the exact sense of the original, so well as: *das dem Manne unterthänige Weib* (Lange); yet, as the idea of subjection, expressed in the Greek, is still, to some extent, implied in *married* it is the best rendering that can be given.—The periphrasis: *so long as he liveth*, is altogether unnecessary; *the living husband*, is both more forcible and more exact.

[2] Ver. 2.—[The active verb *die* should be substituted for *be dead*. The question arises, How can we best express the delicate shade of the Greek conditional proposition: ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ. Alford gives: *have died;* Wordsworth: *shall have died;* Amer. Bible Union: *die*. The first seems preferable; the second is strictly literal, since the aorist implies something which takes place antecedent to what is affirmed in the apodosis, but is not so elegant; the last is that bald conditional form, which should be reserved for the equivalent Greek form (εἰ with the optative or indicative). These remarks apply to the same clause, as it occurs in ver 3.

[3] Ver. 3.—[The negative belongs to the verb, and is joined to the noun, at the expense of forcibleness. Forbes remarks, that here the E. V. destroys the regularity of the parallelism. The first, second, and third lines in the original correspond exactly to the fourth, fifth, and sixth respectively.

Ἄρα οὖν ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρὸς
μοιχαλὶς χρηματίσει,
ἐὰν γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ·
ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνήρ,
ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα,
γενομένην ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ.

So then, as long as her husband liveth,
She shall be called an adulteress,
If she be married to another man;
But if her husband be dead,
She is free from the law so as to be no adulteress,
Though she be married to another man.

[4] Ver. 4.—[*Were made dead* (Amer. Bible Union), though not very elegant, is perhaps the best rendering of ἐθανατώθητε. *Mortify*, would be ambiguous here. *Were slain*, is preferred by Alford, because the more violent Greek verb is used, recalling the violent death of Christ; but this would point to the act of killing, rather than to the fact of being deprived of life, which is the prominent thought here.

[5] Ver. 4.—[Both clauses are final, though differing in form. By changing the first *that* of the E. V. into *in order that*, the force of the Greek is preserved, and its varied form in a measure reproduced.

[6] Ver. 4.—[As *unto God* is the usual rendering of εἰς τὸν θεόν, *to God* will serve to represent the simple dative: τῷ θεῷ. The meaning seems to be: *to the glory of God*.—The dative, τῷ θανάτῳ is also found at the close of ver. 5.

[7] Ver. 5.—[The E. V. usually renders παθήματα, *sufferings*. Here, *passions* (Wordsworth, and others; Lange: *Leidenschaften*) is etymologically exact, and, on the whole, preferable to *motions*, *emotions* (Amer. Bible Union), *stirrings* (Alford).

[8] Ver. 6.—[The *Recepta* reads ἀποθανόντος; a conjecture of Beza's, arising from a misunderstanding of the text, having no uncial support. D. E. F. G. (Vulgate, and some Latin authorities) read τοῦ θανάτου; a gloss, to get rid of the participle, which was regarded as disturbing the structure of the sentence (Meyer). ℵ. A. B. C. K. L., many versions and fathers, warrant the correctness of ἀποθανόντες, which is now almost universally adopted. (The English text is emended to correspond.)

[9] Ver. 6.—[The clause is ecbatic and present: ὥστε δουλεύειν.

[10] Ver. 6.—[If the reference be to the Holy Spirit, the above emendation is necessary. If not (as Dr. Lange holds), the clause should read: *in newness of spirit and not in oldness of letter*. See *Exeg. Notes* on both views.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary.*—*a*. The figure of marriage and the law of marriage to describe the relations of believers to the law (vers. 1–3); *b*. The application of the figure: the marriage did not remain pure, because sin, whose motions were by the law, insinuated itself. It is dissolved by death (vers. 4–6).

Ver. 1. **Know ye not.** [Ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε. Comp. vi. 3. The particle ἤ implies a doubt, and connects always with some preceding categorical clause (Winer, p. 474).—On the connection. Meyer deems it a resumption of vi. 14, but immediately linked to last main thought (vi. 22), viz., that the Christian had his fruit unto holiness, and the end, eternal life (which is proved in vi. 23).—R.] Since the ἤ assumes a doubt at the beginning (chap. ii. 29; vi. 3); the Apostle intimates that not all the believers in Rome are conscious of the whole conclusion, that the gospel has made them free from the service of the Mosaic law—a conclusion that he will now make clear to them by the figure of the law of marriage. Therefore the question, Should you not fully know the consequence of the right of marriage in case one of the couples dies? has this meaning: Should you not fully know the consequence of the death of believers by and for the law? The course of treatment is this: After having shown that they are no more under sin, with more particular reference to the Gentiles, the Apostle now declares, with more particular reference to the Jews, that they too are no more under the law. The unity warranting this transition consists in the fact, that one cannot be under sin without being under the sense of the law, and that he cannot be under the law without being under the sense of sin. So far, therefore, our deduction extends back not only to chap. vi. 14, but even to chap. v. 20; iii. 9; ii. 17. That is, the law comes into consideration here so far as it is the power of the letter, which kills (2 Cor. iii. 6)—the

* [On the difficulty respecting the figure, see the full remarks of Prof. Stuart *in loco*.—R.]

phenomenon is completed as the experience of sin (see ver. 24).

Singular views: 1. Reiche: The *κυριεύειν* in ver. 1 refers to the *κύριος* in the concluding verse of chap. vi; 2. Meyer: The freedom of Christians from the law follows from the truth of the foregoing verse. But the Apostle's transition consists in his design to show that Christians are just as dead to the law by baptism in the death of Christ, as they are dead to sin. This arises from the fact that they have received eternal life as the gift of God in Christ. They are therefore dead, by the death of Christ, to death, as a result of sin, as they are dead to death as a result of the law, according to chap. vii. 24. [Meyer's view in 4th edition is indicated above.—R.]

Brethren. Certainly not merely the Jewish Christians (according to Grotius, and others; also Tholuck, in a qualified way) are meant in this address (Meyer). Yet Meyer, in denying this, overlooks the fact that the Jewish Christians are regarded most prominently, because the point in question is respecting the law (see chap. ix. 3). [The only limitation being "those who know the law," it must be remembered that in the apostolic age, as well as since, the knowledge of the Old Testament on the part of Christians in general is presupposed.—R.]

For I speak to those who know the law. [Parenthetical, as in the E. V. Explanatory of *brethren*.—R.] Of what law does he speak? It must not be overlooked, that what the Apostle further adduces as the design of the law, already reminds of the law of nature. Therefore Koppe: every law is meant. Glöckler: the moral law. But though the Roman law might have a similar purport, the Apostle nevertheless means the Mosaic law itself; for the point of his argumentation is, that, according to the principles of the Mosaic law itself, Christians must be regarded as having been made free by this law. It is not necessary to prove that the Mosaic law in general, but not the law of marriage in particular (Beza, Carpzov [Bengel], and others), is meant here The Jew did not have a separate marriage-law; yet the Mosaic law, with reference to the marriage-law, is meant.—And who are those who know the law? Explanations: 1. The Roman Christians, the majority of whom were Jewish Christans; 2. The Jewish-Christian portion, to whom Paul addresses himself in particular (Philippi, and others); 3. In addition to these, the Gentile Christians, who, as Jewish proselytes, had been entrusted with the law (De Wette, and others); 4. Tholuck calls to mind, that the Gentile Christians became acquainted with the law. [As the customs of the synagogue remained to a large extent those of the early Christian assemblies, the Old Testament was read to all believers, as indeed was necessary to their Christian instruction. One could not be a Christian even then, and remain ignorant of the law.—R.] The question in general here is not a difficult specialty of the Mosaic law, but a principle evidenced also by natural law, which, for this very reason, does not result from one passage, but from the connection of the Mosaic law. Tholuck: "One of the legal maxims current among the Jews; Este endeavors in vain to prove it from the Old Testament." Yet the example of Ruth, Abigail, and even of the second marriage of Abraham, is more than one legal maxim current among the Jews. Moreover, the legal principle in chap. vi. 7 is of kindred nature.

That the law hath dominion. We must not connect *ὁ νόμος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* (Mosheim, and others), but *νόμος* with *κυριεύει*. Man is certainly, however, the man in question placed under the law. [Wordsworth explains: "The law (of Moses) is lord over *the* man—the human creature—whether man or woman. Comp. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Augustine." This takes the verb in the literal sense: *to be lord*, and introduces the figure of the marriage at once, thus avoiding any difficulty about the special law, for the whole law is personified. Meyer seems to favor this view also.—R.]

For as long time as he liveth [*ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ*]. According to vers. 2–4, the *ζῇ* evidently refers to the man himself, and not to the law, so that, in a metaphorical sense, it would have the force (as Origen, Erasmus, Bengel, and others think) of making the figure itself plainer. This would have been to prove first that the law has no more force. Philippi understands the *ζῆν* to be the old, natural life. See Tholuck on the contrary: in this case the appeal to legal knowledge would be inappropriate, and the figure already violated. The law is personified as master, just as sin is in the foregoing section. [And the point of the figure is not affected by referring the verb to the man, for whichever party dies, the relation ceases. Comp. Hodge. —R.] Meyer gives prominence to the point, that *ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον* is emphatic.*

Ver. 2. **For the married woman is bound by the law to the living husband** [*ἡ γὰρ ὕπανδρος γυνὴ τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρὶ δέδεται νόμῳ*]. A concrete explanation of the proposition of ver. 1 (Meyer), introduced by *γάρ*, which has here the force of *for example* (Hodge, Alford). The perfect *δέδεται* here denotes the continuing character of the binding (Winer, p. 255), which agrees with the emphatic *ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον* (ver. 1). "*Ὕπανδρος*, *subject to the man*, married, only here in the New Testament, but current in later Greek authors. —R.] The figure in vers. 2 and 3 is quite clear, but its application is difficult. Since the law is compared with the first man, and Christ with the second, this seemed to be the application that should follow: The law, as the first man of the theocratic Church, is dead; now, the Church can be freely married to Christ. Therefore even Usteri, Rückert, and others, have remarked that the figure is not clearly carried out; and Chrysostom took the view, that Paul, through forbearance toward the Jews, reversed the relation in his application, and that, instead of saying, *the law or the husband is dead*, he says, You who were formerly bound by the law are dead. [So Wordsworth, who, however, joins with it several other reasons.—R.] Meyer, with Fritzsche, thus relieves the difficulty: In consequence of the unity of the matrimonial relation, death is an event common to both parties; when the husband is dead, the wife is legally dead to the husband. We may in this case ask, Why did not the Apostle conform his figure to the application, and designate the wife her-

* [Meyer's note is excellent: "*Not before* he dies does the law lose its dominion over him; *so long* as he lives, he remains subject to it. If this is considered, and an entirely irrelevant '*only* so long as he lives' be not interpolated, the thought seems neither trivial nor disproportionate to the appeal made to the legal knowledge of the readers. For a *peculiarity* of the *νόμος* consists in this, that it cannot, as human laws, have only temporary validity, or be altered, suspended, nor can one be exempt from it for a time, &c. No, so long as man lives, the dominion of the *νόμος* over him remains." Of course, this means previous to the death to the law (ver. 4).—R.]

self as the dead part? Clearly, because of the second marriage. This explanation of Fritzsche and Meyer (concinnity) is established by the Apostle, and also rendered emphatic by his language. As the woman is not dead, but is killed in respect to her marriage relation, or is situated as dead, by the natural death of her husband, so believers have not died a natural death, but are made dead to the law, since they are crucified to the law with Christ. The idea, *dead in a marriage relation*, is therefore the *tertium comparationis*. The θανατοῦσθαι in ver. 4 is therefore like the καταργεῖσθαι of a widow, in which also a death-like orphanage is indicated. That the law itself is also dead, as a letter, by its statutory application to the crucifixion of Christ, follows, without any thing further, from what has been said. Tholuck, not being satisfied with Meyer's removal of the difficulty, seems desirous of placing himself on the side of those who give an allegorical interpretation to the passage commencing with ver. 2. Explanations:

1. The wife is the soul, the husband is sin; sin dies in the fellowship of believers with Christ's death (Augustine, and others; Olshausen).

2. Only the νόμος can be regarded as the husband (Origen, Chrysostom, Calvin, Philippi). Likewise, with special reference to the sense of guilt (Luther); with special reference to sin (Spener).

De Wette and Meyer have properly rejected the introduction of allegory in vers. 2, 3; it destroys all legal evidence of the figure. The Apostle did not avoid saying ἐθανατώθη ὁ νόμος because he wished to give a more pregnant expression to the thought, and to include in one the other side also, but because θανατοῦσθαι is different from a simple ἀποθνήσκειν, and because the retroactive inference from the act which the administration of the law has committed on the body of Christ is proximate to the dying of the law (according to Heb. viii. 13; decayed and waxed old). The gospel is eternally new, because it refers to only eternal relations. The law grows old from the beginning, because, in its outward and national character, it relates to transitory and ever-changing relations. Application to Catholicism and Protestantism. (All they that take the sword, &c.) Ὕπανδρος, *viro subjecta;* the wife had no right to separate herself.*

But if the husband have died, she is loosed from the law of her husband [ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνήρ, κατήργηται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνδρός. On the conditional clause, see *Textual Note* [3]. On the verb, comp. Gal. v. 4, Lange's *Comm.*, p. 127. The genitive is one of reference, of the object respecting which, see Winer, p. 177.—R.] That is, which relates to her husband. On the relationship of the expression κατήργηται to the ἐθανατώθητε, comp. Meyer's translation: "She has become undone, and thereby free and absolved from the law which related to her husband (united her to him)." (See Gal. v. 4.)

Ver. 3. **She shall be called an adulteress.** She receives the name in a formal and legal way. And therewith she is subject to the severest punishment of the law—stoning. [Levit. xxi. 10; comp. John viii. 5.]

[**She is free from that law,** ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου. The article shows that the reference is to *the law of the husband*, hence the E. V.: *that law*, is correct.—R.]

So that she is not an adulteress. Meyer insists upon the idea of design: in order that she be no adulteress; and declares this to be the design of the Divine legal ordinance—which Tholuck there pedantically finds. Yet the expression here might certainly have been chosen with reference to this application. The Judaists assuredly charged the believing Jews with apostasy, and therefore with religious adultery. Hence Paul says εἶναι instead of χρηματίζει;* and Fritzsche has strikingly made the τοῦ μὴ εἶναι dependent on ἐλευθέρα. [All these views are alike grammatical. That of Fritzsche is harsh, however, while Meyer's seems to be adopted more to prepare the way for the parallel he makes (ver. 4): *in order that* ye should be married to another. It is not necessary to press the figure to this extent, however.—R.]

Ver. 4. **Accordingly, my brethren.** [Ὥστε, see Winer, p. 283.—R.] The explanation follows here first; this is not *allegorical*, but *symbolical*, because marriage represents, in the external sphere of life, what religion does in the inward and higher (Eph. v. 32).—**Ye also, as the widowed wife.—Were made dead to the law†** [ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ. See *Textual Note* [4]. The verb is aorist, referring to a definite act in the past, viz. the release from the law at justification.—R.] That is, in relation to the marriage-covenant. The expression ἐθανατώθητε is chosen, not merely because Christ's death was a violent one, but also because it describes the death of Christians to the law as a death incurred by virtue of the administration of the law.

Through the body of Christ [διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ]. In, and, at the same time, with Him, as He was put to death. The atoning effect of the sacrificial death cannot, at all events, be the premise here, although it is included. [The aorist shows that the reference is definite; the proposition indicates the means of the death to the law. Two opinions prevail: (1.) That it refers to the atoning death of Christ as the ground of justification. So Hodge, and others. It may be urged in favor of this, that this is the means or ground of justification, and that thus the antithesis to "was raised" is preserved. But the Apostle generally speaks of the death of Christ in plain terms, when he refers to it. Col. i. 22, which Hodge quotes as an instance of "His body," meaning His death, adds the qualifying phrases, "of His flesh," "through death." (2.) With Tholuck, Meyer, Lange, and others, it may be referred to the fellowship with Christ in His death. This view accords better with the point which the Apostle has reached in his argument, as well as the idea of union with Christ underlying this passage. This does not deny, but implies the atoning efficacy of His death, which is always latent, if not patent, in the Apostle's argument. It has been the fault of some commentators, to insist

* [She is bound to him by the law—*i. e.*, the Mosaic law —which made no provision for her loosing herself (in Deut. xxiv. 2 it was the power of the husband, not the wife, to repudiate the relation). Here the law is no longer spoken of figuratively.—R.]

* [That is, they might be and were so *called*, but yet *were not* guilty of religious adultery.—R.]

† [Dr. Hodge at some length combats the view, that the Mosaic law (or rather the Jewish economy) is alone referred to throughout this passage. He rightly says: "Paul here means by the law, the will of God, as a rule of duty, however revealed." See on iii. 20, p. 122 (also *Galatians*, ii. 16, pp. 49, 52). The most untenable of all views is that which limits νόμος to the ritualistic Jewish observances —R.]

an finding an *expression* of it, where it is only implied.—R.]

Christians are dead, buried (chap. vi.), and risen (Col. iii. 1) with Christ; indeed, they are even, in principle, transported to heaven (Phil. iii. 20). But since they are dead with Him, they are, like Him, dead "to the law through the law" (Gal. ii. 19). [Comp. *Commentary in loco*, pp. 50, 51.—R.] Calvin, Grotius, Koppe, and others, have explained, that the ἐθανατώθη τῷ νόμῳ is a milder expression for ὁ νόμ. ἐθανατώθη, ἀπέθανεν ὑμῖν. This explanation does not regard the difference between natural and violent death, nor self-destruction. The law could not be dead; this would have been revolution. As a Divine form of revelation, it had to grow old and vanish away (Heb. viii. 13); but as a human ordinance it has itself inflicted death. Therefore the law still retained its former historical and ethical (not religious and essential) force toward those who were not dead to it by the fellowship of Christ.

Through the body of Christ, διὰ τοῦ σώματος θανατωθέντος. It may be asked, in what relation this *being dead* with the body of Christ stands to the *being reconciled* by the body of Christ. Tholuck: "Fellowship with the death of Christ includes freedom from the κατάρα of the law (Gal. iii. 10), and this latter, which is brought to pass by thankful love in return, includes the death of the old man to sin (chap. vi. 6) and strengthening to a new life." The *becoming free* from the νόμος is consummated with the development of repentance and faith—that is, with justification; the *having become free* from the old law is decided when the new law, the law of the Spirit, the righteousness of faith, appears (Eph. ii. 16).

In order that ye should be married to another [εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέρῳ. The clause seems to be final. *In order that;* the purpose of the death to the law was union to Christ. —R.] Γίνεσθαι τινος, to become the possession of a husband. The figure of conjugal communion of the believing Church with the Lord (2 Cor. xi. 2; Eph. v. 2, 5; Rev. xxi. 8). *To another*. The stronger ἑτέρῳ is here used. [And it is more closely defined, **even to him who was raised from the dead,** τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθέντι. —With good reason is this added.—R.] Not only do Christians belong to the risen Christ because He has acquired them by His death (1 Peter i.), but also *because they themselves, having been dead with Him, have become a heavenly race, a super-terrestrial people, who, as risen ones, can be united only with the Risen One; therefore their continued connection with the law of this life would be a misalliance. The common element of this new communion is the new life.*

That we should bring forth fruit to God [ἵνα καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ. Final clause (so Tholuck, Meyer, De Wette, Alford). The dative is *dat. commodi* apparently.—R.] The figure of marriage leads to that of the fruit of marriage (Theodoret, Erasmus, Meyer, and others). Tholuck, on the contrary: "Since a reference to καρπός (chap. vi. 22) occurs, and since καρπὸν ποιεῖν, φέρειν, and even καρποφορεῖν (Mark iv. 20; Luke viii. 15; Col. i. 10), frequently occur in a metonyme derived from the fruits of the field, as a technical Christian phrase for the practical effects of the life of faith, and the allusion recurs in ver. 6, where the figure is not that of marriage, it seems very unsafe to accept the figure of the fruit of children." Reiche and Fritzsche have even rejected this interpretation, because an undignified allegory arises; they have therefore construed the figure as referring to the field, or fruits of the field. Philippi likewise; De Wette, on the contrary, accepts the former view. But the allegory of an unfruitful marriage cannot be more dignified than that of a fruitful one. Yet the spiritual fruit of righteousness, in accordance with its supersensuous nature, is produced for God, for glorifying God. [The figure must not be so pressed as to make the fruit of the marriage *to God*, as Father; to His glory, is the meaning.—R.]

Ver. 5. **For when we were in the flesh** [ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί. Meyer: "The positive and characterizing expression for the negative: when we were not yet made dead to the law." Alford: "Virtually = 'under the law.'" Hodge: "When in your unrenewed and legal state." For a more thorough discussion, see the Excursus in the next section.—R.] The antithesis of ver. 5 should serve to explain the last conclusion in ver. 4. The γάρ tells us: According as we were situated in our fleshly tendency, we must now also be situated in the Divine tendency. The εἶναι denotes the standpoint of personality; the outward tendency of life from a definite principle. Here, therefore, the tendency of life is from the principle of the flesh. Explanations: 1. Meyer: The σάρξ, the humanity in us (what, then, would not be human in us?),* in its opposition to the Divine will; the element of life in which we exist. The opposite to the ἀποθανόντες of ver. 6. 2. Theodoret, Œcumenius: In the κατὰ νόμον πολιτεία. The flesh is the material and external part of the body and the life. Therefore, since we stood in this external tendency, which, as an external and analytical form of life (dependent on the individual ἐπιθυμίαι), also in its better form, took the law as a combination of external and analytical precepts. [Of these, (1.) is much to be preferred. Dr. Lange does not make it clear whether he adopts the view of *flesh*, given immediately above. There are very strong objections to it in any case. —R.]

The passions of sins [τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν]. According to Meyer and Tholuck, the genitive of object. "From which the sins arose." Tholuck cites James i. 15 as proof. We hold, however, that sins are here denominated producers of the passions. For the passions, παθ., are not, as Tholuck holds, the same as the ἐπιθυμίαι (according to which Luther translates *lusts*), but they are the ἐπιθυμίαι enhanced by the impulse of the law. Then, in the case of sins arising as consequences of the παθήμ., the idea would follow that abortions to death have been produced from the marriage-bond of the law itself with man. The connection with the law assumes, therefore, at the same time, a connection with the ἁμαρτία (see chap. vi. 13), and this, in the isolation of individual ἁμαρτίαι, was operative as producer by the sinful passions excited by the law in the members. The law itself did not bring forth the fruit of death; but it stirred up sin, so that the latter made the ἐπιθυμίαι into παθήματα, and thus into productive forces [Either view is preferable to the Hendiadys: *sinful*

* [To this interpolation it may be rejoined: What, then, would not be σάρξ in us? What is not carnal, sinful, in us?—R.]

feelings (Olshausen, Hodge), which is forbidden by the plural ἁμαρτιῶν. Παθήματα is passive (comp. Gal. v. 24), and hence it is perhaps better to take the genitive, as that of the object (which led to sins), so as to accord with what is predicated in ἐνηργεῖτο.—R.]

Which were by means of the law. Τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου. Grotius supplies φαινόμενα, which is too little; Meyer, *sc.*, ὄντα, which is far too much. According to ver. 9, ἀναζῶντα. Tholuck: "Many of the older commentators, in order not to let the law appear in too unfavorable a light, explained thus: of the knowledge of sin communicated by the law (thus Chrysostom, Ambrose, Bullinger, and others). Yet, thus construed, διὰ νόμου would stand beyond the pragmatism of the passage." Tholuck, like Meyer, would also supply the *verb. subst.* [The proximity of ver. 7 supports the obvious meaning: *occasioned by the law* (Meyer: *vermittelt*), not *caused*, however.—R.]

Wrought [ἐνηργεῖτο]. Middle. Were efficient in a fruitful manner.

In our members [ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν. Hodge weakens the force, by making this almost = *in us*.—R.] Single productions between individual passions and individual members, in which the central consciousness was enslaved for the production of individual miscarriages.

To bring forth fruit to death [εἰς τὸ καρποφορῆσαι τῷ θανάτῳ. This clause expresses not merely the result (Hodge), but the final object of the energizing (Meyer, Alford,), being parallel to the last clause of ver. 4.—R.] Meyer: *To lead a life terminating in death.* Expressing but little, almost nothing, here. That false fruit, abortions, or miscarriages, might arise (wherefore the subst. καρπός itself must be avoided). Erasmus: *ex infelici matrimonio infelices fœtus sustutimus, quidquid nasceretur morti exitioque gignentes.* Luther: Where the law rules over people, they are indeed not idle; they bring forth and train up many children, but they are mere bastards, who do not belong to a free mother. Meyer would also here limit death to the idea of eternal death; see above. [He also carries out the figure of progeny, which Lange retains here, so far as to make "death" here a personification. This is less justifiable than the reference to eternal death, which conveys a truth, and forms a fitting antithesis to τῷ θεῷ (ver. 4).—R.]

Ver. 6. **But now we have been delivered from the law** [νυνὶ δὲ (antithesis to ὅτε, ver. 5) κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου. Notice the aorist, which Paul uses so constantly in reference to the accomplished fact of justification.—R.] We are annulled in relation to the law, and therewith the law is annulled to us. (On the reading ἀποθανόντος, see the *Critical Note on the Text;* also Tholuck, p. 330.)

Having died to that wherein we were held [ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα]. We must understand τούτῳ before ἐν ᾧ. Meyer explains: in which we were confined as in a prison. More in harmony with the former view is this: whereby we were chained as by a legal and even matrimonial obligation. Wherefore we certainly do not need to refer ἐν ᾧ merely to νόμος (with Origen, Koppe, De Wette, Philippi [Hodge], and others). Tholuck: "The law, therefore, is regarded as κατέχων, as a chain, analogously to the ἐφρουρούμεθα συγκεκλεισμένοι, Gal. iii. 23, so far as it holds its subjects in δουλεία (Rom. viii. 15; 2 Tim. i. 7). The direct reference of the ἐν ᾧ to sin (according to Chrysostom, Œcumenius, and others) is too strong on the opposite side."—The cause of the chaining of man by sin on one side, as well as by the law on the other, was the totality of the εἶναι ἐν τῇ σαρκί, as it expressed itself in mere divisions of lust and legality. This is clear from what follows: *in the oldness of the letter.*

So that we serve [ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς. The clause is not final, as the E. V. indicates; the service is a present state, already resulting from the accomplished fact of deliverance from and death to the law. *Serve God*, is the meaning, the omission of θεῷ being due to the self-evident difference of reference in the two phrases which follow. The consciousness of the readers would tell them that the old service was one to sin, the new one to God (so Meyer).—R.] The δουλεύειν can be spoken ironically in only a conditional manner. We have really our external life to enslave, but not after the old way, in single portions and acts, according to individual precepts, motives, and affections, but in the newness of the Spirit; therefore by virtue of the perfect principle of the Spirit, which is ever new, and always assuming a new form. The ἐν denotes not merely the sphere of activity (Meyer), but the power, the principle of activity itself.

In newness of the Spirit [ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος. Untenable views: That ἐν is redundant, and the dative the object of the verb δουλεύειν; that there is a Hendiadys (*new spirit*, Hodge). The E. V. is fond of Hendiadys, and very often misconstrues ἐν, but has avoided these mistakes in the present instance. Alford correctly remarks, that the datives "are not" as in vi. 4, *attributes* of the genitives which follow them, but *states in which* those genitives are the *ruling elements.*—What is the precise force of πνεύματος?—R.] Meyer: "It is the Holy Spirit, as the operative principle of the Christian life." Clearly, it is the spirit as itself the inward Christian principle of life, which is certainly not to be thought of without the communion of the Holy Spirit. For the Holy Spirit as πνεῦμα simply, operating objectively, was also the producer of the γράμμα, which here constitutes the antithesis. This principle is itself an eternal newness, and has, as a result, an eternal newness as the principle of the absolute renewal. Tholuck: "The spirit of grace produced by God's gracious deed." [With Meyer, Alford, and others, it seems best to refer this to the Holy Spirit. The absence of the article is not against this view; as the opinion of Harless, that πνεῦμα without the article is subjective, is not well established. (Comp. Meyer on Rom. viii. 4; Harless, Eph. ii. 22; Lange's *Comm.*, Gal. v. 16, p. 137.) This passage seems to point to chap. viii., where πνεῦμα occurs so frequently, in the sense of the Holy Spirit; the more so as σάρξ occurs just before (ver. 5). The objection, that the Holy Spirit, working objectively, was the author of the letter, and hence that the antithesis requires another meaning, has not much weight. See notes on Rom. viii. 4 ff.—R.]

And not in the oldness of the letter [καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι (only here) γράμματος. Not = *old letter* (Hodge), nor yet = *under the law, in the flesh*, though these latter thoughts are implied. The genitive seems to be *gen. auctoris*, as πνεύματος in the previous clause.—R.] On the γράμμα, see chap. ii. 29; 2 Cor. iii 6. The law

viewed externally, and, by its historical and subjective externalization, become an old and dying object, παλαιότης. Meyer writes somewhat unintelligibly: The παλαιότης, according to the nature of the relation in which the γράμμα stands to the principle of sin in man, was necessarily sinful (see ver. 7 ff.), as, on the other hand, the καινότης must be necessarily moral in consequence of the vitally influencing πνεῦμα. [The service which resulted from the rule of *the letter*, was not merely their old service, but a service having in it an element of decay. The service under the law, precisely the written law (when viewed as the γράμμα), was a killing yoke, is still, when the service is in the oldness of the letter. Meyer evidently means, that a law with external precepts, of the letter, necessarily so acts upon man's sinfulness, that the very service he attempts to render is sinful. *The letter killeth* (2 Cor. iii. 6).—Such a characterization of the service under the law forms a fitting warning against a return to legalism—an appropriate conclusion to this section, and a point of connection with ver. 7.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The connection with sin, according to chap. vi. 12–23, was a slavish state; the connection with the law, on the other hand, according to the present section, was comparable to an earthly marriage-state. The connection of believers with Christ now appears, in comparison with this, as a super-terrestrial marriage-covenant (see Eph. v. 32).

2. It is only by keeping the figure of the law of marriage free from an allegorical interpretation, and by distinguishing between the figure itself and its historical application, that the evidence clearly appears which the argumentation of the Apostle contemplated, and particularly for the Jewish Christians. But this evidence still continues in force. The standpoint of external legality, and that of living faith, cannot be confused as religious principles. Both standpoints are sundered by the death of Christ. Where they seem to be united, the confession of the law, or the legal confession of faith, is the dominant religious principle; while the opposite principle has the meaning only of a historical and ethical custom, which, from its nature as a legal custom, as much limits the Catholic man of faith, as it, in the character of an evangelical custom, burdens the legal, Romanizing Protestant.

3. Tholuck: "The law is annulled in relation to believers, not in its moral import, but, as Calovius remarks, *quoad rigorem exactionis, quoad maledictionem et quoad servilem coactionem.*" According to the Sermon on the Mount, as well as according to Paul, it is done away so far as it is fulfilled; it is annulled in a negative sense so far as it is annulled in Christian principle, the law of the Spirit. An inward principle has come from the external precept; an inward rule from the external form; an inward tendency from the external law; a unity from multiplicity; a synthesis from the analysis; and from the ordinance, "Do this and live," the order, "Live and do this." It must be borne in mind, that Paul here speaks of the finite, formal character of the law, and not of the law as a type of the New Testament, as it has become transformed into the law of the Spirit. [Comp. *Doctrinal Notes* on *Galatians*, iii. 19–29, p. 88, 89.—R.]

4. The figure of marriage, which extends through the Old Testament in typical forms, is here employed in reference to the relation between Christ and the whole body of believers. The individual believer participates freely in the marriage-bond of this body, yet not in a mystical, separatistic isolation of his relation to Christ.

5. In ver. 5 Paul speaks especially concerning the *passions of sins*, which are excited and occasioned by the law; and there is no reason for understanding among them the *abnormal* forms of passionate excitement. The history of Pharisaism, and of fanaticism in general, from the crucifixion of Christ down to the present day, teaches us how very much additional weight is also added by the *normal* forms. In this direction there has arisen the *odium generis humani*, as well as the increasingly strong warfare of hierarchical or ecclesiastical party-law against the eternal moral laws of humanity, in which the nature of God himself is represented, while in the statute only the distorted apparent image of the Church, and not its eternal pith, is reflected.

6. The abortions of ordinances at enmity with the gospel and humanity reached the centre of their manifestation in the crucifixion of Christ; but they everywhere reappear, where Christ is again crucified, in a grosser or more refined sense. And this not only occurs where the written revealed law is perverted into fanatical ordinances, but also where the ideals of the natural law (Rom. ii. 14) are distorted to fanatical caricatures, as is shown in the history of the Revolution of 1848.

7. On ver. 6. Tholuck: "γράμμα, πνεῦμα (chap. ii. 29). The former is chiefly a designation of the external principle; the latter, of the inwardly operative principle. And this inwardly operative principle is the gracious spirit produced by God's gracious act. Calvin: *Spiritum litteræ opponit, quia antequam ad dei voluntatem voluntas nostra per spiritum sanctum formata sit, non habemus in lege nisi externam litteram, quæ frænum quidem externis nostris actionibus injicit, concupiscentiæ autem nostræ furorem minime cohibet.* And Melanchthon: *Ideo dicitur littera, quia non est verus et vivus motus animi, sed est otiosa imitatio interior vel exterior, nec ibi potest esse vera invocatio, ubi cor non apprehendit remissionem peccatorum.*"

8. How the law, in its letter or finite relation, began to grow old immediately after the beginning of legislation, is shown to us clearly by the history of the Israelites; and Deuteronomy even gives the canonical type of this truth. The history of the Christian Church teaches, on the other hand, how the newness of the spiritual life becomes constantly newer in its power of renewal. But the same antithesis is again manifested in the continual obsolescence of the Church in the Middle Ages, and in the continued rejuvenating of the evangelical Church.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

On Chap. vii. 1–6.

As Christians, we belong no more to the law, but to Christ. 1. Because we are dead to the law by Jesus, who abolished the power of the law; 2. Because we are united to Him by the same fact, in order to bring forth fruit to God (vers. 1–6).—Marriage as a type of spiritual relations: 1. As a type of our relation to the law; 2. As a type of our relation to Christ (vers. 1–6).—As the relation of man

to Christ is altogether different from that to the law, so is Christian marriage, on the other hand, altogether different from that of the Old Testament (vers. 1–6).—How death divides, but also unites (ver. 4).—Union of heart with Christ the Risen One is the condition of the happy union of human hearts with each other so as to bring forth fruit unto God (ver. 4).—How miserable it was to live under the law in the flesh; how happifying it is to live under grace in the Spirit! Proof: 1. Description of the state under the law: *a.* we were in bondage; *b.* sinful lusts worked in our members to bring forth fruit unto death; *c.* we served the letter. 2. Description of the condition under grace: *a.* we are free; *b.* the newness of the Spirit incites us to bring forth fruit unto God; *c.* we serve the Spirit, and not the letter any more (vers. 5, 6).

STARKE: As a thistle-bush is full of thistles, so are unconverted and carnal men full of the fruits of the flesh (ver. 5).—Christ frees us from the burden of the law, that we may take His yoke upon us (ver. 6).—HEDINGER: We are free from the law, not as a precept of duty—which remains perpetually—but in its condemnation, compulsion, and sharpness (ver. 1).—Where there is not a heart and ready will, there is only external labor and weariness; where conversion of the life and spiritual increase are not exhibited in the inner man, it is lost work and the service of the letter, even if one should wear out the temple-floor with his knees, give his body to be burned, and become a beggar and a hermit!

SPENER: Our perverted nature is such, that, when any thing is forbidden, we have all the greater desire to have it. We have often seen children think less of, and have no desire for, a certain thing, for which they have all the more desire when forbidden. So, when the law forbids this and that, we are prompted toward it by our wicked nature (ver. 5).—We are not so free that we do not have to serve any more; only the kind of service is different. Formerly it was compulsory, now it is rendered with a joyful will; then it was the letter, now it is the spirit (ver. 6).—ROOS: The truth which Paul here portrays (vers. 1–4) is this: that nothing but death annuls the dominion of the law.

LISCO: The complete freedom of man from the law promotes his true sanctification (vers. 1–6).—The relation of man to the law.—Application of this relation to believers (ver. 4).—Advantages of the new state above the old one under the law (vers. 5, 6).

HEUBNER: The Christian is free from the coercion of the law (vers. 1–6).—The death of Christ became freedom from the compulsory power and curse of the law: 1. As abrogation of the Levitical sacrificial system; 2. As inducement toward free and thankful love toward God (ver. 4).—Irreligious politicians express only their ignoble and servile manner of thinking, when they deem all religion to be only of service as a bridle for the people (ver. 4).—The nature of the Christian is *spirit:* 1. In reference to faith; 2. In reference to action. The latter stands in contrast with this spirit in these same respects (ver. 6).

BESSER: Here, for the first time since chap. i. 13, Paul addresses the saints at Rome as *brethren*—brethren "in Christ Jesus our Lord" (ver. 1).—"But now"—this *now* is an evangelical key-note of the Epistle to the Romans; comp. chap. iii. 21, and other places (ver. 6).

LANGE: The death of Christ a serious boundary between the legal and the evangelical, believing, standpoints: 1. The meaning of this boundary itself; 2. The application: no religious *confusion* of the two standpoints. By a *customary* connection of them, one is made to mean only a moral limitation, which, after all, is not in conformity with the internal relations.—The sensuous power and spiritual weakness of legalism consists in its being an earthly relation, confined to this life, though in the fear of God (in this life the head, the city of God, the apparent image of the kingdom, &c.).—The marriage-bond of the free Church of God is a superterrestrial relation, and therefore the power of the renewal of the earthly life: *a.* Christ in the next life and in this one; *b.* Faith also; *c.* The Church as well.—The reciprocal action between the law and sin unto death, a counterpart to the reciprocity between the Spirit of Christ and faith unto new life.—The contrast between the Old and New Testament in its full meaning: 1. The Old Testament growing old and making old from the beginning; 2. The New Testament renewing itself and the world from the beginning.—But a New Testament is in the *essence* of the Old, as well as an Old is in the *manifestation* of the New.

[BURKITT: All the wisdom of the heathen, and of the wisest persons in the world, was never able to discover the first sinful motions arising from our rebellious natures; only the holy law of God makes them known, and discovers them to be sin. Such is the holiness of the law of God, that it requires not only the purity of our actions, but also the integrity of all our faculties.—SCOTT: Self-righteous pride and antinomian licentiousness are two fatal rocks on which immense multitudes are continually wrecked, and between which none but the Holy Spirit can pilot us; and the greatest objections of open enemies to the doctrines of grace derive their greatest plausibility from the unholy lives of many professed friends.—CLARKE: The law is only the means of *disclosing* our sinful propensity, not of *producing* it: as a bright beam of the sun introduced into a room shows millions of motes in all directions—but these were not introduced by the light, but were there before, only there was not light enough to make them manifest—so the evil propensity was in the heart before, but there was not light sufficient to discover it.

LITERATURE, CHIEFLY HOMILETICAL, ON THE 7TH CHAPTER OF ROMANS: ARMINIUS, *Dissertation on the True and Genuine Sense of Romans VII.*, Works, 2, 471; E. ELTON, *Complaint of a Sanctified Sinner Answered, or Explanation of the 7th Chapter of Romans*, London, 1618; J. STAFFORD, *Scripture Doctrine of Sin Considered, in Twenty-five Discourses on Romans VII.*, London, 1772; J. GLAS, *The Flesh and the Spirit*, Works, 3, 142; J. FRASER, *Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification;* A. KNOX, *Letter to J. S. Harford, Esq., on the Seventh Chapter to the Romans*, Remains, 3, 409.—J. F. H.]

Fifth Section.—*Synopsis: The law, in its holy design, by the feeling of death, to lead to the new life in grace. The development of the law from externality to inwardness. The experience of Paul a sketch from life of the conflict under the law, as well as of the transition from the old life in the law to the new life in the Spirit.*

Chap. VII. 7-25.

7 What shall we say then? *Is* the law sin? God forbid. [Let it not be!]
Nay, [but] I had not known [*i. e.*, recognized] sin, but by [except through] the
law: for I had not known lust [evil desire],[1] except the law had [if the law
8 had not] said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion [,] by the com-
mandment, [*omit comma*] wrought in me all manner of concupiscence [evil desire].
9 For without the law sin *was* [*is*] dead. For [Now] I was alive without the
law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived [sprang into life], and
10 I died. And the commandment, which *was ordained* to [*was* unto][2] life, I
11 found [the same, *or*, this, was found by me] *to be* unto death. For sin, taking
occasion [,] by the commandment, [*omit comma*] deceived me, and by it slew *me*.
12 Wherefore [So that] the law *is* holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and
good.
13 Was [Did] then that which is good made [become][3] death unto me? God
forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in [to] me by
[through] that which is good; [,] that sin by [through] the commandment
might become exceeding [exceedingly] sinful.
14 For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal,[4] sold under sin.
15 For that which I do [perform],[5] I allow [know] not: for what I would, that
do I not [not what I wish,[6] that I practise]; but what I hate, that do I.
16 If then I do that which I would not [But if what I wish not, that I do], I
17 consent unto [I agree with] the law that *it is* good. Now then it is no more
18 [longer] I that do [perform] it, but sin that dwelleth [dwelling] in me. For
I know that in me (that is, in my flesh), dwelleth no good thing [good doth not
dwell]: for to will [wish] is present with me; but *how* [*omit how*] to perform
19 that which is good I find not [*or*, *is* not].[7] For the good that I would [wish],
20 I do not: but the evil which I would [wish] not, that I do [practise]. Now
[But] if I do that I[8] would [wish] not, it is no more [longer] I that do
21 [perform] it, but sin that dwelleth [dwelling] in me. I find then a [the] law,
22 that, when I would [wish to] do good, evil is present with me. For I delight
23 in the law of God after the inward man: But I see another law in my mem-
bers, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to[9]
the law of sin which is in my members.
24 O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this
25 death [*or*, this body of death]?[10] I thank God [*or*, Thanks to God][11] through
Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself [I myself with the
mind][12] serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 7.—[The E. V. renders ἐπιθυμίαν here *lust*, in ver. 8, *concupiscence*, and the verb ἐπιθυμήσεις, *covet*. In order to preserve the correspondence, the Amer. Bible Union translates the noun *coveting* in both places. We are forced to retain *covet* in rendering the verb, but it seems better to give the noun a more exact translation, even at the cost of variation from the verb. *Lust* is too specific, *concupiscence* too rare, *desire* would be indefinite without the adjective *evil*. "The misfortune is that we have no English noun that corresponds well to the *generic* sense of the verb *covet*" (Stuart).

[2] Ver. 10.—[The italics of the E. V. are virtually a gloss. *Was* only need be supplied. *For* is a favorite emendation, but *unto* brings out the telic force of εἰς quite as well.—The passive form of the Greek is restored in the second clause.

[3] Ver. 13.—[א. A. B. C. D. E., Lachmann, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth, Tregelles, read ἐγένετο instead of γέγονε (*Rec.*, K. L.). The correction probably arose from not understanding the historical aorist (Alford). The Amer. Bible Union follows the latter reading, which is now considered incorrect.

[4] Ver. 14.—[א[1]. A. B. C. D. E. F. G., Griesbach, Lachmann, Scholz, Tischendorf, Meyer, Wordsworth, Tregelles, and Lange, read σάρκινος instead of σαρκικός (*Rec.*, א[3]. K. L.); the latter being very naturally substituted to correspond with πνευματικός. It was also more familiar. On the meaning, see *Exeg. Notes*.

[5] Ver. 15.—[Three Greek verbs of kindred signification: κατεργάζομαι, πράττω, ποιέω, occur in this verse, recurring throughout the section. The E. V. renders all three, *do*, except in ver. 18, where the first verb is translated, *perform*. It is better to retain this throughout, and render πράττω, *practise*, as etymologically exact. Alford denies any distinction between the last two verbs.

[6] Ver. 15.—[*Would* (E. V.) is an inexact rendering of θέλω. The choice lies between *will* and *wish*. The former is to be preferred, if the idea of simple, spontaneous volition is deemed the prominent one; the latter is favored by the presence of μισῶ, indicating an emotional feature in the volition. See *Exeg. Notes*.

[7] Ver 18.—[א. A. B. C., many versions and fathers, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Tregelles, omit εὑρίσκω. It is inserted in D. F. K. L., *Rec.*, by many fathers, Meyer, Wordsworth, Lange, and others. Meyer deems the omission due to the transcriber's hastily passing over from οὐχ to οὐ at the beginning of ver. 19. Lange holds that εὑρίσκω would disappear, as soon as the sententious antithesis (To will is immediately present, but the carrying out of that which is good I can never find) was no longer understood.

[8] Ver. 20.—[א. A. K. L., insert ἐγώ after θέλω. Meyer, Alford, Tregelles, and others, follow B. C. D. F. in omitting it. The analogy of vers. 15, 18 is against it, but Lange deems it important to mark a progress in the thought.

[9] Ver. 23.—[א. B. D. F. K., and some cursives, insert ἐν before τῷ νόμῳ. Omitted in *Rec.*, A. C. L., fathers. Most modern editors reject it. Tregelles retains it. If retained, it cannot mean *by means of* (see Alford).

[10] Ver. 24.—[On these two renderings, see *Exeg. Notes*.

[11] Ver. 25.—[There is considerable variation here. The *Rec.*, א[1]. A. K. L., read εὐχαριστῶ. B. has χάρις τῷ θεῷ, which is adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Tregelles, Lange. We find also: ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ and τοῦ κυρίου. Meyer contends for the reading of the *Recepta*, which certainly has the best MSS. support.

[12] Ver. 25.—[Forbes:

Ἄρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγώ
  Τῷ μὲν νοΐ δουλεύω νόμῳ Θεοῦ,
  Τῇ δε σαρκί, νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας.

So then I myself
  With my mind serve the law of God,
  But with my flesh the law of sin.

Lange, however, seems to take μέν . . . δέ as = *either* . . . *or*. See *Exeg. Notes*.—R.]

A.—*The development of life under the law as development of the knowledge of sin.*

Summary.—1. The law in relation to sin; vers. 12, 13. *a.* The holiness of the law in its relation to the sinfulness of man; vers. 7–12. *b.* The effect of the law in harmony with its design: Disclosure of the deadly effect of sin, in causing it to complete itself as well in facts as in the consciousness; ver. 13.—2. The sinner in relation to the law; vers. 14–23. *a.* The revelation of man's carnal nature or tendency in general under the spirituality of the law; ver. 14. *b.* The disclosure of the sinful obscuration of the understanding; or the dispute of knowledge; vers. 15, 16. *c.* The disclosure of the sinful obscuration of the will; or the dispute of the will; vers. 17, 18. *d.* Disclosure of the sinful obscuration of feeling; or of the unconscious ground of life; vers. 19, 20. *e.* Disclosure of the darkening of the whole human consciousness by the opposition of God's law and a mere seeming law; or the deadly rent in the whole man; vers. 21–23.—3. The unhappy premonition of death, in the sense of the entanglement by the (seeming) body of death, and the release from it; ver. 24. 4. The transition from death to life; ver. 25. *a.* The redemption, in the former half of the verse. *b.* Conclusion in relation to the starting-point of the new life; second half of ver. 25.

B.—*The same development as transition from the law to the Gospel, from ruin to salvation.*

(Eph. v. 13: "But all things that are reproved are made manifest by the light: for whatsoever doth make manifest is light.") *a.* The holy design of the law to discover the root of sin, and with the sense of guilt to awaken the sense of death; vers. 7–12.—*b.* The wholesomeness of this complete unmasking of sin in its absolute sinfulness; ver. 13.—*c.* View of the conflict between the spiritual and divine character of the law, and the carnal character of the sinner; ver. 14.—*d.* Consciousness of the want of clearness and supremacy of understanding; vers. 15, 16.—*e.* Consciousness of the want of firmness and energy of will; vers. 17, 18.—*f.* Consciousness of the weakness of the nobler sentiments, and the superior power of the lower; vers. 19, 20.—*g.* The consciousness of the chasm between the inner man and the outward life; of the rent between the two reciprocally contradictory laws; vers. 21–23.—*h.* The fruit of this development: the consummated consciousness of the necessity of deliverance; ver. 24.—*i.* Deliverance and the new law of life: clear distinction between knowledge and flesh; ver. 25. The *I* is distinguished, first from sin in knowledge, then in the will, then in the feeling, then in the whole consciousness of the inward nature, but finally in the inquiring cry for the Redeemer.

General Preliminary Remarks.—We come first of all to the question, In what sense does the Apostle speak in the first person singular? what does the ἐγώ mean? Different views: The expression is a μετασχηματισμός, see 1 Cor. iv. 6—that is, the representation of one figure in another. Thus the Greek fathers applied the passage to the fall of Adam, or of the human race (Tholuck: "By way of example, the introduction of man into the paradisaical condition").—Others believed the Jewish people before and under the law denoted (Chrysostom, Turretin, Wetstein, Reiche). The view of the Socinians and Arminians (Grotius, and others) was a modification of this one, that the *homines plerique* are meant, who, under the legal economy, have surrendered themselves to a gross life of sin. But the Apostle evidently speaks of a human condition of soul, in which the inward conflict of life is very earnest and great; and the language of his own experience is unmistakable. Even if he spoke of the human race in general, or of the Israelitish people in particular, he could not speak of a mere μετασχηματισμός, which would be excluded from the organic connection by the Apostle's theological view But since the Apostle uses the most forcible language of his own experience, his expression is ἰδίωσις (κοινοποιΐα); that is, he expresses in his experience a universal human experience of the relation of man to the law (Meyer, and others).* For it is self-evident that the Apostle could have no occasion to describe a special experience concerning himself alone.

But now the second question arises: What state of the soul has the Apostle portrayed? Does this

* [Wordsworth, less correctly, says: "By the pronoun *I*, the holy Apostle personifies Human Nature, and identifies it with himself, and says, in his own name and person, what he means to be applied to Mankind generally, in their unregenerate state." This author follows his usual patristic bent, in implying that this is a description, not of what *was*, but *might have* been Paul's experience. This zeal for the honor of "the holy Apostle" is undoubtedly at the expense of his sincerity.—R.]

passage refer to the condition of the unregenerate, or of the regenerate?

Views.—1. The *unregenerate:* The Greek fathers, Augustine before his controversy with the Pelagians (*prop.* 44 *in Ep. ad Rom.*); also Jerome, Abelard (to a certain extent), and Thomas Aquinas; then Erasmus, Bucer, Musculus, Ochino, Faustus Socinus, Arminius (on Affelman, see Tholuck, p. 328); the Spener school (according to the suggestions of Spener); and later exegetical writers. [Among these, Julius Müller, Neander, Nitzsch, Hahn, Tholuck, Krehl, Hengstenberg, Rückert, De Wette, Ewald, Stier, Stuart, Ernesti, Messner, Schmid, Lechler, Kahnis, and Meyer (most decidedly). Some of these, however, really support the modified view upheld below (4).—R.].

2. The *regenerate:* Methodius in the *Origenianis* (see Tholuck, p. 336); Augustine in the controversy with the Pelagians (on account of vers. 17, 18, 22, 25: *Retract.* i. 23, &c.); * Jerome, Luther, Calvin, Beza, the orthodox school; recently Kohlbrügge, *Das 7te Kapitel des Briefes an die Römer* (1839).

3. The first section, from vers. 7-13, treats of the *unregenerate;* vers. 14-25, of the *regenerate:* Philippi [whose careful and thorough discussion (*Comm.*, pp. 249-258) is one of the ablest in favor of this reference.—R.]. The identity of the subject is against this view. Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i. p. 469: "The Apostle does, indeed, speak of his present condition, but apart from the moral ability to which he had grown in Christ." According to Meyer, this is the earlier Augustinian view (of the unregenerate); but it seems to be scarcely an intelligible one. [This view (referring only vers. 14-25 to the regenerate) is that of most Scotch expositors (latterly Brown, Haldane, Forbes); of Delitzsch (*Bibl. Psychol.*, pp. 368 ff., 2d ed.), and is ably defended by Dr. Hodge. As the current Calvinistic interpretation, it requires further consideration. Mention must be made also of the modified form of it held by Alford.† The arguments in favor of making the sharp transition at ver. 14, are as follows, as urged by Hodge: (1.) The *onus probandi* is on the other side (on account of the first person and present tense). (2.) There is not an expression, from the beginning to the end of the section, ver. 14-25, which the holiest man may not and must not adopt (3.) There is much which cannot be asserted by any unrenewed man. (4.) The context is in favor of this interpretation. The positions (2) and (3) must be discussed in the exegesis of the verses as they occur (especially vers. 14, 15, 22). It will be found that there is very great difficulty in applying all the terms in their literal sense exclusively to either class. Philippi is most earnest in upholding the 3d position of Hodge. In regard to (1), it may be observed, that the first person is used in vers. 7-13, so that the change from the past to the present tense alone enters into the discussion. Is this change of *tense* sufficient to justify so marked a change in the *subject?* A consistent attempt to define the subject throughout on this theory, leads to the "confusion," which Alford admits in the view he supports.—The context, it may readily be granted, admits of this view; for in chaps. v. and vi. the result of justification, the actual deliverance from sin, has been brought into view, and ver. 6 says: *we serve*, &c. But, on the other hand, it must be admitted that vers. 7-13 recur to the ante-Christian, legal position. Not until ver. 25 * is there a distinct Christian utterance, while chap. viii. sounds like a *new* song of triumph. If the Apostle is holding the distinctively Christian aspect of the conflict in abeyance, though describing the experience of a Christian, in order that he may give it more force in chap. viii., he is doing what is not usual with him as a writer, still less with a struggling believer in his daily experience. The context, we hold, points most plainly to the view given next, and adopted by Dr. Lange.—R.]

4. The Apostle is not describing a quiescent state, but the process in which man is driven from the law to Christ, and an unregenerate person becomes a regenerate one. So Olshausen: "The state under the law cannot coëxist with regeneration, and without question, therefore—as chap. vii. 24 is to express the awakened need of redemption, and ver. 25 the experience of redemption itself—vers. 14-24 are to be referred to a position *before* regeneration, and to be understood as a *description of the conflict within an awakened person.* Since, however, the Apostle makes use of the present for this section, while before and afterwards he applies the aorist, we are led to the idea that he does not intend to have this state of conflict regarded as concluded with the experience of redemption. In the description (vers. 14-24) itself, also, as will afterwards be more particularly shown, an *advance* in the conflict with sin is clearly observable; the better *I* stand out in the man, more and more the pleasure in God's law gradually increases. This is the case in a still higher degree, as ver. 25 expresses, *after* the experience of the redeeming power of Christ, where the conflict with sin is described as for the most part victorious on the side of the better part in man. But a battle still continues, even after the experience of regeneration," &c.—In all this, the antithesis, *under the law* and *being free from the law*, does not bear being confounded. It only admits of the condition, that the Christian must again feel that he is weak, so far

* [Tholuck, Stuart (Meyer, Lange, apparently), attribute the change in Augustine's views to the Pelagian controversy; Dr. Hodge, on the other hand: "to a deeper insight into his own heart, and a more thorough investigation of the Scriptures." In the *Expositio Quarundam Prop. Ep. Rom. Prop.* 45 (not the incomplete commentary) the earlier view is stated (394). It is repeated in *Ad Simp.* (397), *Conf.* vii. 21 (400). The Pelagian controversy began about 412. It is not until 420 that the other view is presented (*Contra duas Epistolas Pel. ad Bonifac.*, i. 12). It is repeated in *Retractationes*, i. 23, i. 1 (427), and in *Contra Jul.*, vi. 18 (about the same time). The language of Augustine is as follows (in *Retrac.*): *quæ postea lectis quibusdam divinorum tractatoribus eloquiorum, quorum me moveret auctoritas, consideravi diligentius et vidi etiam de ipso apostolo posse intelligi quod ait* (ver. 14); "*quod in eis libris quos contra Pelagianos nuper scripsi, quantum potui diligenter ostendi.*" The tone of the whole section is polemic. This fact, in connection with the dates above given, shows that the probabilities are strongly in favor of the view of Stuart. A general change may have been going on, but, as regards this passage, the change seems due to the exigencies of the controversy. Comp. Migne's edition *Augustini Opera*, i. 620, iii. 2071, &c.; also Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, iii. pp. 988 ff.—R.]

† [This view is as follows: From vers. 7-13 is historical, carnal self under the convictions of sin in the transition state. Ver. 14 is still of the carnal self, but Paul, in passing forward, transfers himself into his present position by the change of tense. Speaking in this tense, he begins to tell of the motions of the will toward God (ver. 15, which is true only of the regenerate). Then *an apparent verbal confusion* arises, the *ego* having a wider meaning in ver. 17 than in ver. 18, &c. After ver. 20, the subject is the *actual then existing complex self* of Paul in his state of conflict This view is more easily justified by the exegesis of separate verses than that of Dr. Hodge, yet the "confusion" is great.—R.]

* [Forbes defends this view, however, from the parallelism in the latter part of ver. 25.—R.]

as he falls momentarily under the law of the flesh, and thereby under the law of death. Even Bengel finds in this section a progress, but he does not correctly describe it: *Sensim suspirat, connititur, enititur ad libertatem. Inde pedetatim serenior fit oratio.* But after the combatant experiences deep conviction, he declines, rather, into despair; but then this is the way to complete deliverance.

Tholuck properly remarks: "As the question is usually raised, whether the regenerate or the unregenerate person is spoken of, it produces misunderstanding so far as the *status irregenitorum* comprehends in itself the very different states of soul of the *status exlex carnalis* and of the *status legalis;* then, how far the relation of Old Testament believers to law and regeneration is regarded differently; and finally, how far the idea of regeneration has been a self-consciously variable one."

[This view is, on the whole, the most satisfactory. It admits the conflict *after* regeneration, but guards against the thought that this is a description of distinctively Christian experience. It is rather that of one under the pedagogy of the law "unto Christ," whether for the first time or the hundredth time. It is the most hopeful state of the unregenerate man; the least desirable state of the regenerate man. Of course, it cannot be admitted that there is a third class, a *tertium quid*, the awakened. This view seems to be the one which will harmonize the polemics of the past. Jowett adopts it, Schaff also, while Delitzsch, after advocating (3), says: "He speaks of himself the regenerate—*i. e.*, of experiences still continuing, and not absolutely passed away—but he does not speak of himself *quâ* regenerate—*i. e.*, not of experiences which he has received by the specifically New Testament grace of regeneration." He further admits that such experiences might occur in the heathen world, according to Rom. ii. 15. The advantages of this view are very numerous. It relieves the exegesis of a constant constraint, viz., the attempt to press the words into harmony with certain preconceived anthropological positions. It agrees best with the context. Its practical value is beyond that of any other. See *Doctr. Notes.*—R.]

On the literature, see the *Introduction.* Also Tholuck, p. 339, where the explanations of Hunnius and Aretius may also be found. Winzer, *Programm*, 1832. A treatise in Knapp, *Scripta varii argumenti.*

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

First Paragraph, Vers. 7-12.

Ver. 7. **What shall we say then?** [Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; see the note on this expression, iii. 5, p 118. Comp. also ix. 30, where the use is different.—R.] Intimation that another false conclusion must be prevented. Though the Christian be dead to the law, it does not follow that the law is not holy. But it belongs to a preceding stage of development.

Is the law sin [ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία]? Origen [Jerome]: the *lex naturalis.* Tholuck: the Mosaic law. Certainly the question is respecting the justification of the latter. [Jowett paraphrases: *Is conscience sin?*—which seems almost an exegetical caprice. His reason for it, that the consciousness of sin, rather than a question of new moons and Sabbaths, is under consideration, betrays an entire misapprehension of the ethical purpose of the law of Moses. It may be admitted that an inferential reference to all law can be found here, but the passage is an account of an historical experience, which took place under the Mosaic law.—R.]

Sin. The usual interpretation: *cause of sin* Metonymically, the operation named, instead of the cause, as 2 Kings iv. 40; Micah v. 1: Samaria is sin for Jacob. On the other hand, De Wette and Meyer say: Is the law sinful, immoral? After what precedes, it may well mean: Is it the real cause of sin, and, as such, itself sinful? [Bengel: "*causa peccati peccaminosa.*" "Ὁ νόμος itself being abstract, that which is predicated of it is abstract also" (Alford).—R.] Even this conclusion is repelled by the Apostle with abhorrence, μὴ γένοιτο.

Nay, but. The ἀλλά is taken by some in the sense of ἀλλάγε: *but certainly.* He repels the thought that the law is sin, but yet he firmly holds that it brought injury (Stuart, Köllner, and others; Meyer, Hofmann). Tholuck, on the other hand (with Theodore of Mopsvestia, Abelard, and others), sees, in what is here said, the expression of the opposite, viz., that the law first brought sin to consciousness. It may be asked whether this alternative is a real one. If the law be really holy, because it has driven sin from its concealment and brought it fully to manifestation, then there is no alternative here. [This seems decisive against Stuart's view. Meyer (4th ed.) renders ἀλλά, *sondern.* The law is not sin, *but* its actual relation to sin is that of *discoverer* of sin. This is much simpler than Alford's view: *I say not that, but what I mean is that.* The objection that this implies a praise of the law (De Wette) is without force. He might well praise it as leading toward ver. 25; viii. 1.—R.]

But it may be asked, in connection with this view, How are the words, **I had not known sin** [τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων], to be explained? According to Cyril, Winzer, De Wette, Philippi, and Tholuck, this refers to the knowledge of sin alone; but, according to Meyer, and others, it refers to the becoming acquainted with sin by experience. Meyer: "The principle of sin in man, with which we first become experimentally acquainted by the law, and which would have remained unknown to us without the law, because then it would not have become active by the excitement of desires for what is forbidden, in opposition to the law." This explanation lays too much stress upon the second point of view. According to chap. v. 20, vi. 15, and ver. 8 of this chapter, it is, however, not doubtful that the Apostle has here in mind not only the knowledge of sin, but also the excitement of sin. But he does not have it in mind as the increase of sin in itself, but as the promotion of its manifestation and form for the judgment.

Except through the law [εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου]. Olshausen: "The law in all the forms of its revelation." Meyer properly rejects this. Although the law further appears as immanent in man, yet, ever since the Mosaic law, by which it was awakened, it has the character of the second, threatening, and deadly law. The moral law of nature, ideally conceived, is one with human nature. [The citation from the Decalogue, immediately following, shows what the reference is.—R.]

For I had not known evil desire [τήν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ ᾔδειν. See *Textual Note* [1]. Γάρ confirmatory, not = for example On τε, see Tholuck, Stuart, Winer, p. 404. I- v

untranslatable in English; here a sign of close *logical* connection. On the distinction between the verbs, Bengel says: *ἔγνων majus est, οἶδα minus. Hinc posterius, cum etiam minor gradus negatur, est in incremento.* The verb is strengthened also, in this conditional clause, by the absence of ἄν, which would usually be inserted.—R.] We cannot translate this, with Meyer: "For I would not have known desire," &c. This would make the law the producer of lust, which is not the Apostle's meaning. That lust was present without the law, he had sufficiently asserted in chaps. i. and v. But now he has become acquainted with the corrupting and condemnatory character of wicked lust, under the prohibition:

Thou shalt not covet (Exod. xx. 17), [Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις. On the prohibitory future of the law, as quoted in the New Testament, see Winer, p. 296; Buttmann, *N. T. Gramm.*, p. 221.—R.] As this was to him the principal thing in the law, he thus first understood the inner character of the law and the inward nature of sin; but thus also was the propensity to evil first excited, in the most manifold way, by the contradiction in him. The desire was now to him universally and decisively the principal and decisive thing. The first view of the inner life, or of the interior of life, had now occurred. Tholuck remarks, that Augustine and Thomas Aquinas regarded the *concupiscentia* as the *generale peccatum* from which all the others proceeded; but he observes, on the contrary, that the τέ in the sentence suggests rather a subordinate relation. But is the ᾔδειν subordinated or *separated* in relation to the whole sentence? For I never once *understood* the meaning of wicked lust without the law.

To what period of Paul's life does this belong? To the time of his childhood (Origen); or of his Pharisaical blindness ("the elder Lutheran and Reformed exegesis down to Carpzov")? Tholuck gives reasons for the latter. According to Matt. v., Pharisaism was narrowed to the act. He cites pertinent expressions of Kimchi, and other Jewish writers (see also the note, p. 352). In Jarchi, the explanation of the Tenth Commandment is wanting; in Aben Ezra there is a dwarfish construction. But then he raises the objection, that a person like Paul must have earlier come to a knowledge of the sinfulness of the ἐπιθυμία. But the knowledge of the sinfulness of the ἐπιθυμία has its first awakening significance, when wicked lust is recognized as the root of supposed good works, and thereby leads to a revolution of the old views on good works themselves. Even the fanatic rejects not only wicked works in themselves, but also their root—wicked desires. But he defines wicked desires and good affections according to evil and good works, while the awakened one begins to proceed from the judgment on inward affections, and afterwards to define the works. Therefore we cannot say, that οὐκ ἔγνων and οὐκ ᾔδειν stand here merely hypothetically; the question as to the subject of this declaration must be raised first in ver. 9 (Tholuck). Vers. 7 and 9 denote the same experience through which Paul, as the representative of all true contestants, passed under the law: ver. 7 on the side of the perception of sin, ver. 9 on the side of the excitement of sin.

Ver. 8. **But sin.** The δέ is, indeed, "continuative" (Meyer), [not adversative (Webster and Wilkinson).—R.], yet not in reference to the history of the development of the sinful experience, but so far as its second stage is given.—*Sin*, ἡ ἁμαρτία; that is, sin inwardly present as peccability; the ἐπιθυμία, as it was just shown to be sin [The principle of sin in man, as in ver. 7. To admit a personification, as held by Fritzsche and Stuart,* is unnecessary; to refer it to actual sin (Reiche), is contrary to the context. Comp. Olshausen, Koppe, Philippi, Hodge.—R.]

Taking occasion [ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα]. The ἀφορμή denotes the external impulse or occasion, in opposition to the inner. [Not merely *opportunity;* "it indicates the furnishing the material and ground of attack, the *wherewith* and *whence* to attack" (Alford). Its position is emphatic, though the whole phrase is probably thus rendered prominent.—R.] The λαμβάνειν in λαβοῦσα, as free, moral activity, must be made emphatic here. Therefore Reiche says, incorrectly: it *received* occasion.

By the commandment wrought in me [διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατηργάσατο ἐν ἐμοί]. The διὰ τῆς ἐντολ. must be connected with κατηργ. (Rückert, Tholuck, Meyer), and not with ἀφορμ. λαβ. (Luther, Olshausen, Tholuck).† The sentence contains the declaration how sin took an occasion for itself. It operated just *by the commandment* [the single precept referred to ver. 7], since it regarded the categorical commandment as a hostile power, and struggled and rebelled against it.

The immediate design of the commandment in itself was the subjection of the sinner; but the prospective result was the rising of sin, and this result should bring sin clearly to the light in order to capacitate the sinner for deliverance. Meyer says ambiguously: "Concupiscence is also without law in man, but yet it is not concupiscence for what is forbidden." Certainly the positive prohibition first appears with the law; but the variance of the sinner with the inner law of life is already perfectly present. But now refractoriness toward the positive command makes its appearance, and enhances and consummates sin.

All manner of evil desire [πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν]. The ἐπιθυμία was already present; but it now first unfolded and extended itself to the contrast. Zwingli, and others, interpret this as the *knowledge* of lust; Luther, Calovius, Philippi, and others, interpret it properly as the *excitement* of lust. Tholuck: "According to ver. 11, sin deceives, as is exhibited in the history of the fall of man; to man every thing forbidden appears as a desirable blessing; but yet, as it is forbidden, he feels that his freedom is limited, and now his lust rages more violently, like the waves against the dyke;" see 1 Cor. xv. 46. [Philippi well says of this: "An immovably certain psychological fact, which man can more easily reason away and dispute away, than *do away*." ‡—R.]

* [Stuart makes ἁμαρτία here almost = ἐγὼ σαρκικός (ver. 14 ff.). If an equivalent is necessary, σάρξ is a preferable one. For full, almost fanciful, notes on the presumed personification, see Wordsworth *in loco*.—R.]

† [The proof of this connection is, that διά is never joined with ἀφ. λαμβ. (ἐκ is usual); that vers. 11, 13 seem to require it.—R.]

‡ [The following citations from the classics support the universality of the principle set forth in this verse (comp. Prov. ix. 17):

Cato (Livy xxxiv. 4): *Nolite eodem loco existimare, Quirites, futuram rem, quo fuit, antequam lex de hoc ferretur. Et hominem improbum non accusare tutuis est, quam absolvi, et luxuria non mota tolerabilior esset, quam erit nunc ipsis vinculis, sicut fera bestia irritata, deinde emissa.* Seneca (*de Clementia*, i. 23): *Parricidæ cum lege cœperunt, a illis facinus pœna monstravit.* Horace (*Carm.*, i. 3):

For without the law sin is dead [χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά. A general proposition, hence, with the verb omitted. Beza and Reiche incorrectly supply ἦν; so E. V., *was.* It will readily be understood that νεκρά is not used in an absolute, but relative sense, = *inoperative* (or unobserved, if the reference be limited to the knowledge of sin). Against this the antithesis of the following verse may be urged.—R.] Meyer, incorrectly: "*not actively*, because that is wanting whereby it can take occasion to be active." Rather, sin cannot mature in its root; it cannot come to παράβασις. Man has, to a certain extent, laid himself to rest with it upon a lower bestial stage, which is apparently nature; the commandment first manifests the demoniacal contradiction of this stage, the actual as well as the formal contradiction to God and what is divine (see chap. viii. 8). It is incorrect to limit the statement, with Chrysostom, Calvin, and others, to knowledge—*it was not known;* or, with Calovius, to the conscience (*terrores conscientiæ*); or, finally, to limit the idea to *the sphere of desire* (Tholuck). It has not yet acquired its most real, false life, in the παράβασις. Reference must here be made to the antithesis: *Sin was dead, and I was alive.* [The clauses, however, are not strictly antithetical.—R.]

Ver. 9. **Now I was alive without the law once** [ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ. *For* (E. V.) is incorrect; δέ must then be rendered *but* or *now* (*i. e.*, moreover), as it is taken to be *adversative* or *continuative.* The latter is to be preferred, on the ground that this clause continues a description of the state without the law, while the real antithesis occurs in the following clause, for which the particle *but* should be reserved.—R.] In order to define the sense, we must apply the twofold antithesis. Paul could only have lived first in the sense in which sin was dead in him, and also be dead in the sense in which sin was alive in him.

I was alive. The *I* must be emphasized: "the whole expression is pregnant (Reiche, on the contrary, merely ἦν)".

Explanations: 1. *Videbar mihi vivere* (Augustine, Erasmus [Barnes], and others).

2. *Securus eram* (Melanchthon, Calvin, Bengel [Hodge], and others), I lived securely as a Pharisee.

3. Meyer says, to the contrary: "Paul means the life of childlike innocence which is free from death (ver. 10), (comp. Winzer, p. 11; Umbreit in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1851, p. 637 f.), where (as this condition of life, analogous to the paradisaical state of our first parents, was the cheerful ray of his earliest recollection) the law had not yet come to knowledge, the moral spontaneity had not yet occurred, and therefore the principle of sin was still in the slumber of death. This is certainly a *status securitatis*, but not an immoral one." * Tholuck reminds us of the fact, that the Jewish child was not subject to the law until his thirteenth year; but he accedes (and properly so) to the views of the elder expositors. Paul first perceived the deadly sting of the law when he was forbidden to lust. The child, as a child, has childish devices; 1 Cor. xiii.; but it can here come into consideration only so far as its religious and moral consciousness began to develop. But the *status securitatis* of which the Apostle here speaks, first begins where the innocent child's *status securitatis* ceases. It consists in the sinful life being taken, after the course of the world, as naturalness instead of unnaturalness. And this can also continue under the law, so long as the law is regarded as something external, and is referred to mere action. The Apostle first dates the true existence of the law for man from the understanding of the *Thou shalt not covet.* As, therefore, Meyer has above given too Augustinian a view of original sinfulness, so he here construes it too much on the opposite side.

In a historical reference, this text, according to Rom. v. 13, has especially in view the period from Adam to Moses. It has, therefore, even been said that Paul here speaks, in the name of his people, of the more innocent and pure life of the patriarchs and Israelites before the gift of the law (Grotius, Lachmann, Fritzsche, and others). Undoubtedly, that *historical* stage is included; yet here the psychological point of view predominates: the life of the individual up to the understanding of the Mosaic expression, Thou shalt not covet. The law also points, by the οὐκ ἐπιθ., beyond itself; as the sacrificial offering, &c.

Now I was alive. This means, according to Meyer, "Man, during the state of death (*Todtsein*) of the principle of sin, was not yet subject to *eternal* death. Certainly he became subject to physical death by the sin of Adam." We have already refuted this distinction. The condemned are first *actually* subject to death at the final judgment; *in principle*, the children of Adam are subject to it; but the living man, of whom Paul here speaks, had not yet fallen into it, in the personal consciousness of guilt and the personal entanglement in the παράβασις.

But when the commandment came [ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς. The specific command, not the whole law. *Came*—*i. e.*, was brought home to me.—At this point the older Lutheran and Calvinistic expositors found a reference to the conviction of sin immediately preceding conversion. But the use of ἐντολή is against this, as well as the drift of the whole passage. A writer, so loving in his repetition of the name of Christ, and in direct reference to the work of Christ, would not have left such a meaning obscure. Comp. Philippi on the psychological objections.—R.] When its inward character became known. This certainly has an his-

Audax omnia perpeti
Gens humana ruit per vetitum nefas.

Ovid (*Amor.*, 2, 19, 3): *Quod licet ingratum est, quod non licet acrius urit;* (3, 4) *Nitimur in vetitum semper cupimusque negata.*

To this may well be added the remark of Goethe (in a letter to Lavater): *Ich möchte das Element woraus des Menschen Seele gebildet ist und worin sie lebt, ein Fegfeuer nennen, worin alle höllischen und himmlischen Kräfte durcheinander gehen und wirken* (I might call the element, out of which the soul of man is formed and in which it lives, a purgatory, in which all hellish and heavenly powers confusedly walk and work).—R.]

* [The legitimate result of this interpretation is Jowett's position: "The state which the Apostle describes is in some degree ideal and imaginary." There is no such time of innocence, but rather a time of *security*, "before the deeper energies of the moral nature are aroused." All that period, in the individual consciousness, as well as secondarily in the historical development of redemption, is referred to by ποτέ. Granting, as a fair exegesis of the whole context compels us to do, that the termination of this period was not at the entrance of Christian knowledge of the law, we may well include the thought urged so strongly by Prof Stuart: "Before an individual has a distinct and vivid perception of the nature and spirituality and extent of the Divine law, he is less active and desperate in his sin and guilt than after he comes to such a knowledge." The view of vers. 7, 8, as including excitement of sin, commits us to advance to this position.—R.]

torical application to the gift of the Mosaic law (Reiche, Fritzsche), but a psychological application to the designated moments of introspection.

Sin sprang into life [ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν] The explanation of the ἀνέζησεν, *revived* (*i.e.* Rückert, De Wette, and others. Tholuck:* "The ἀνά stands, as elsewhere in compound words, in the strengthened meaning of *sursum;* comp. ἀναβλέπω in John ix. 11," &c.), is opposed by Meyer, in accordance with the elder expositors, and by Bengel and Philippi. Bengel makes this explanation: *sicut vixerat, cum per Adamum intrasset in mundum.* Certainly the ἁμαρτία became perfectly alive first in Adam as παράβασις, and then as such νεκρά, until the gift of the Mosaic law again brought it to life. But this is also repeated psychologically in the individual so far as the Adamic παράβασις is psychologically reflected more or less strongly in his first offences; thus an individual λαμβ. of the fall takes place, but then, until the awakening light of the law penetrates the conscience, a false state of nature enters, connected with an active sense of life. [Here, too, must be included both the knowledge of and excitement to sin.—R.]—Some Codd. read ἔζησε, because the expression ἀναζῆν did not occur in the classical Greek and in the Septuagint. Origen thought there was here a reminder of a pre-terrestrial fall. Cocceius: *evidentius apparuit.*

And I died [ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον]. In the same sense as sin became alive, did the sinner die. That is, with the sense of conscious [and increasing] guilt, the sense of the penalty of death has made its appearance. Meyer makes an inadequate distinction here: "We must understand neither physical nor spiritual death (Semler, Böhme, Rückert, and others), but eternal death, as the antithesis, εἰς ζωήν, requires." The sense of the penalty of death makes no distinction of this kind. [The aorist points to a definite occurrence. He entered into a certain spiritual state, which he calls death. Calvin: *Mors peccati vita est hominis; sursum vita peccati mors hominis.*—R.]

Ver. 10. **And the commandment, which was unto life, the same was found by me to be unto death** [καὶ εὑρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωήν, αὕτη εἰς θάνατον. *Καί* introduces the verse as an epexegesis of *died*, with the addition of a new circumstance (Stuart).—R.] Supply οὖσα before *unto life.* In what sense was the commandment thus found? The commandment has certainly promised life to the one observing the law; Lev. xviii. 5; Deut. v. 33; Matt. xix. 17. It is, however, easily misunderstood when there is such a general explanation as this: "the promise of life was connected with the observance of the Mosaic commandments" (Meyer). The sense is rather from the beginning, that the kind of promise is conditional on the kind of observance. External obedience has also only an external promise, or a promise of what is external (Exod. xx. 12). But this is, for the pious, only the figure of a higher obedience and promise. The self-righteous man, on the other hand, made a snare for himself out of that promise. Now, in the highest sense, life according to the law of the Spirit—that is, in faith (which is the end of the law) —results in the ζωὴ αἰώνιος. Only the transition from death to life lies between the two. It is just the most intense effort to fulfil the law that results in death. This is a circumstance which seems to contradict the εἰς ζωήν, and yet it does not contradict it, but is quite in harmony with it.

The same. We hold that, according to the sense, we must read αὐτή (with Lachmann, De Wette, Philippi), and not αὕτη, with Meyer and Tischendorf [Alford, Tregelles]. For the law has only temporarily become transformed, as the same law of life, into a law of death; it has not permanently become a law of death.*

Ver. 11. **For sin, &c.** [ἡ γὰρ ἁμαρτία, κ.τ.λ. The γάρ introduces an explanation of ver. 10. The first words are similar to ver. 8, but ἁμαρτία here stands emphatically first. The position of διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς is also slightly emphatic.—R.] Not the commandment in itself has become a commandment unto death; sin has rather made it thus. How far? Sin took occasion, or made itself an occasion. That it took it of the commandment, is assumed, and is explained by what follows. The following καὶ δι' αὐτῆς, &c., favors the connection of the διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς with ἐξηπάτησέ με, **deceived me.** It first made the commandment a *provocation*, and then a means of *condemnation.* Thus what applies to Satan, that he was first man's *tempter*, and then his *accuser*, applies likewise to sin. This passage calls to mind the serpent in Paradise, as 2 Cor. xi. 3. But in what did the deception of sin consist? Philippi: "Since sin made me pervert the law, in which I thought that I had a guide to righteousness, into a means for the promotion of unrighteousness." † Not clear. It deceived me, in that it represented the law to me as a limit which seemed to separate me from my happiness. Behind that limit it charmed me to transgression by a phantom of happiness. Accordingly, it is not satisfactory to explain the following clause: **And by it slew me** [καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀπέκτεινεν], thus: *sin gave me over to the law, so that it slew me.* In this respect sin rather falsified the law, since it represented to me my well-merited death as *irremediable*, or my *judge* as my *enemy* (see Gen iii.; Heb. ii. 15; 1 John iii. 20). ["*Brought me into the state of sin and misery,*" already referred to in ver. 10. The allusion to the temptation is to be admitted here also.—R.] Tholuck: "Decision of Simeon Ben Lachish: The wicked nature of man rises every day against him, and seeks to slay him (Vitringa, *Observ. Sacr.*, ii. 599); also by the יצר הרע is denoted the angel of death."

Ver. 12. **So that the law is holy**, &c. [ὥστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος, κ.τ.λ. The ὥστε introduces the result of the whole discussion, vers

* [So Stuart: "*to gather new life, to show additional vigor*, not merely a renewal of life which had before existed." On the lexical objections to this view, see Philippi *in loco.*—R.]

* [It is more difficult than important to decide this point. Αὕτη, *hæc, this;* αὐτή, *ipsa, the same.* The former, though not in itself so emphatic, here takes the preceding subject, *this very commandment*, giving it a tragical force (so Meyer and Philippi, whom Lange cites in favor of the other view). The analogy of vers. 15, 16, 19, 20 (τοῦτο) is against Lange's preference.—R.]

† [So Hodge: "The reference is not to the promised joys of sin, which always mock the expectation and disappoint the hopes, but rather to the utter failure of the law to do what he expected from it." This view consists with the assumption, that the point in experience here reached is one necessarily and immediately preceding conversion. Dr. Hodge does not thus assume, yet he appeals to *Christian* experience in confirmation. If the excitement to sin be allowed throughout these verses, the other interpretation, adopted by Dr. Lange, is preferable. Comp., however, a beautiful setting forth of the first view in Neander, *Pflanzung*, ii. 681 (quoted in Tholuck).—R.]

7–11. It is not = *ergo*, yet of a more general conclusive character. To μέν, the corresponding δέ is wanting. The antithesis we should expect, according to Meyer, is: *but sin brought me to death through the law, which was good in itself.* This is the thought of ver. 13; but as the form is changed, δέ does not appear.—R.] Not only innocent (Tholuck), but also absolutely separated from, and opposed to, sin. And this applies not only to the law in general, but also to its explanation in the single commandment.

[**And the commandment holy and just and good,** καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή.] The commandment is first *holy* in its origin as God's commandment; secondly, *just*, as the individual determination of the law of the system of righteousness (Meyer:* "rightly constituted, just as it should be"); and *good*—that is, not in the vague sense of *excellent* (Meyer, Philippi, and others), but according to the idea of what is good: beneficial promotion of life in itself, in spite of its working of death in me; indeed, even by its working of death. The term *good* refers to the blessed result of divine sorrow, and to the gospel.† The elaborate apology for the commandment is certainly (according to Meyer) occasioned by the fact that the ἐντολή has been described as precisely the object of sin, in ver. 7

SECOND PARAGRAPH (VER. 13).

The Law in relation to the Sinner.

Ver. 13. **Did then that which was good become death unto me?** [Τὸ οὖν ἀγαθὸν ἐμοὶ ἐγένετο θάνατος; See *Textual Note* [2].] Tholuck: "The μέν in ver. 12 prepared for the antithesis ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία, κ.τ.λ. Yet the Apostle again presents his thoughts in the form of a refutation of an antagonistic consequence. The ἀγαθόν should lead us to expect only wholesome fruits." Undoubtedly, the expression ἀγαθή (ver. 12) is the new problem now to be solved. It was not so much to be wondered at that the commandment, as holy and just, brought death; but it was an enigma that it, as ἀγαθή, should bring forth death. The explanation of this enigma will also show how the law has brought about the great change: Through Death to Life! Was that which is good, of itself and immediately, made death unto me? This conclusion, again, is to be repelled by **Let it not be!** μὴ γένοιτο.

But sin [ἀλλὰ ἡ ἁμαρτία (supply ἐμοὶ ἐγένετο θάνατος). So all modern commentators. —R.] Namely, that was made death unto me. "The construction of Luther, Heumann, Carpzov, &c., is totally wrong: ἀλλὰ ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη (ἦν) θάνατον, ἵνα φανῇ ἁμαρτία" (Meyer); so also the Vulgate.

That it might appear sin [ἵνα φανῇ ἁμαρτία. The ἵνα is telic; φανῇ, *be shown to be* (Alford). This second ἁμαρτία is a predicate; anarthrous, therefore, and also as denoting character.—R.] This was therefore the most immediate design of the law: Sin should *appear* as sin (Eph. v. 13; Gen. iii.: Adam, where art thou?).

[**Working death to me, by that which is good,** διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον.] The idea of perfectly disclosed sin is just this: that it works death by the misconstruction and abuse of what is good. Thus the law is first made to serve as a provocation to sin unto death; second, the gospel is made a savor of death; and third, the truth is made a mighty antichristian lie (2 Thess. ii. 11). Tholuck: "The nature of sin should thereby become manifest, that it should appear as something which makes use of what is even good as a means of ruin, and in this manner the commandment should become a means of exhibiting sin in all the more hideous light." Scholium of Matthæus: "ἵνα αὐτὴ ἑαυτὴν ἐλέγξῃ, ἵνα ὅλη τὴν ἑαυτῆς πικρίαν ἐκκαλύψῃ." In addition to this, these pertinent words: "*In fact, as it is the sovereign right of good to overrule evil results for good, so is it the curse of sin to pervert the effects of what is good to evil.*" Thus an emphasis rests on the διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, for which reason it comes first.

Meyer correctly urges, against Reiche, that this ἵνα is telic, in opposition to the ecbatic view. Death was already present before the law, but sin completed it by the law; κατεργαζομένη. The law is not sin; sin disclosed itself completely as sin in making what is good a means of evil.

That sin through the commandment might become exceedingly sinful [ἵνα γένηται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς. Parallel clause to the last, of increased force: "Observe the pithy, sharp, vividly compressed sketch of the dark figure" (Meyer).—R.] Καθ' ὑπερβολήν. Frequently used by Paul; 2 Cor. i. 8; iv. 17; Gal. i. 13. The ἁμαρτωλός appears to be an intimation that sin, as an imaginary man, should be driven from real human nature to destruction. [The telic force of these clauses is thus expanded by Dr. Hodge: "Such is the design of the law, so far as the salvation of sinners is concerned. It does not prescribe the conditions of salvation. Neither is the law the means of sanctification. It cannot make us holy. On the contrary, its operation is to excite and exasperate sin—to render its power more dreadful and destructive."—R.]

[EXCURSUS ON BIBLICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL TERMS.—The exact significance of the terms σάρξ and πνεῦμα, as used so frequently by the Apostle in this and the eighth chapters, requires careful consideration at this point. But such a discussion must necessarily be preceded by some remarks on the words, σῶμα, ψυχή, πνεῦμα, body, soul, and spirit, as used by Paul in a strictly anthropological sense.

I. Σῶμα, BODY. This term is readily understood as generally used in the New Testament. Still it refers, strictly speaking, to the *bodily organism*, and has a psychological meaning almost = *sense*, the sensational part of man's nature. As distinguished from σάρξ (in its physiological sense), it means the organism, of which σάρξ is the material substance. (Κρέας differs from σάρξ, in not including the idea of an organism.) That σῶμα must not be restricted to the material body, irrespective of its organism and vital union with the immaterial part of man's nature, is evident from the numerous

* [This is a mistake. The quotation is from Philippi. Meyer says: "right, with respect to its requirement, which corresponds exactly with holiness."—R.]

† [Bengel is excellent: *Sancta, justa, bona, ratione causæ efficientis, formæ, finis.* His second view is less exact: *respectu officiorum erga Deum, respectu proximi, respectu naturæ in se.* Comp. Calovius (in Tholuck and Philippi), and Theodoret (in Alford).—R.]

passages (Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. vii. 27; Eph. i. 23; Col. i. 18, &c.), where the Church is called the body of Christ. This expression would convey little meaning, if σῶμα had not this psychological sense. No difficulty arises in regard to this term, except in the interpretation of a few passages which seem to imply an ethical sense; *e. g.*, Rom. vi. 6 (q. v.); vii. 24; viii. 10, 13; Col. ii. 11. It must be remarked, that in most of these the ethical force really belongs to some attributive word, σῶμα being in itself indifferent. We may explain most of these cases by giving the word a figurative sense, *the organism of sin* (Rom. vi. 6; vii. 24; Col. ii. 11), analogous to *the old man;* or by admitting a reference to the body as the chief organ of the manifestation of sin. The term μέλη, *members* (which is usually associated with σῶμα, rather than with σάρξ, because the idea of an organism is more prominent in the former term), must be interpreted accordingly (see Col. iii. 5; *Bibelwerk*, p. 64, Amer. ed.). In any case, the thought that the body is the chief source and seat of sin, must be rejected as unscriptural, unpauline, and untrue. We must also avoid a dualistic sundering of the material and immaterial in man's nature.

II. Ψυχή, SOUL. This term is from ψύχω, to breathe, to blow, and, like נֶפֶשׁ, its Hebrew equivalent, originally means *animal life* (see the New Testament usage, especially in the Gospels), but, like the Hebrew word, it also is frequently referred to the whole immaterial part of man's nature, in distinction from σῶμα. By synecdoche, it is put for the whole man, in enumeration (Acts ii. 41: about three thousand souls), and in the phrase, πᾶσα ψυχή, *every soul.* As the word occurs but four times in the Epistle to the Romans—twice in the sense of *life*, and twice in the phrase, *every soul*—it would not be necessary to discuss it further, did not the precise meaning of πνεῦμα depend upon a further discrimination. Twice in the New Testament (1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. iv. 12) the word is distinguished from πνεῦμα. As both passages may be regarded as Pauline, the one occurring in his earliest written Epistle, and the other in an Epistle of much later date, which is Pauline, even if not written by Paul, the question of a Pauline trichotomy cannot be avoided. The fuller discussion will be found under πνεῦμα, below, but here we must define ψυχή more closely. Although it is true that the term does mean the *animal soul*, it is very doubtful whether it means simply this in the two passages above referred to. If "animal soul" be restricted to the principle of life, then σῶμα, in such a connection, should include this; and a wish that the principle of life be "preserved blameless," is singular, to say the least. If, however, "animal soul" be taken to include more than this—viz., what we share with the brutes—then it is highly probable that this largely includes the intellectual part of our nature, and ψυχή must then be = the seat of the Understanding, in distinction from the Reason. That some wide sense is involved, is evident both from 1 Cor. xv. 45, "the first Adam was made a living soul," and from 1 Cor. ii. 14, where the adjective ψυχικός undoubtedly includes the intellectual part of man's nature. In both these cases the antithesis is πνεῦμα in the ethical sense; hence the greater necessity for enlarging the idea of ψυχή.* Passing over many distinctions which have been made, we consider the view of Olshausen, who makes ψυχή the centre of our personality, the battle-field of the flesh and human spirit. In this view, also, σάρξ and σῶμα are almost identical, though he admits that, in the unrenewed man, the ψυχή is under the dominion of the σάρξ. It excludes the νοῦς from the ψυχή, making it the organ of activity for the human spirit. This view still restricts ψυχή too much, even admitting the trichotomy.* It confuses psychological and ethical terms. It leans toward the error which makes the body the source of sin, while, on the other hand, it excludes the human spirit from the dominion of sin (and its organ, the νοῦς). It cannot be justified by Paul's language, for the very passages which indicate a trichotomy imply the sinfulness of the human spirit, while it is altogether unpauline, as already remarked, to refer sin to the body as its source. The use of the word ψυχικός, as quoted above, is equally opposed to this view, which probably grows out of the attempt to find in ψυχή and πνεῦμα, terms analogous to the Understanding and Reason. We therefore object to this view, and claim a still wider sense for ψυχή. How much can be claimed for it, will appear from what follows.

III. Πνεῦμα, SPIRIT. This term, from πνέω, to blow, to breathe, means (like the Hebrew רוּחַ) *breath*, then *wind*, then *anima*, lastly *animus*, *spirit*, in all the various meanings we give that word. It must first be discussed in its strictly psychological meaning.

A. Besides the secondary meaning, *temper*, *disposition*, it is used by most of the New Testament writers to denote man's immaterial nature, including, together with σῶμα (Rom. viii. 10; 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 34), and also with σάρξ (2 Cor. vii. 1; Col. ii. 5), the whole man. In the phrase, "gave up the ghost," it is doubtful whether it means the whole immaterial nature, or simply *life;* in Luke xxiii. 46; Acts vii. 59, the former seems to be the meaning. But there are a number of passages where the exact signification turns on the previous question: Do the Scriptures assume or teach a trichotomy in human nature?—that man is a unity made up of body, soul, and spirit? It is essential to the proper understanding of chaps. vii. and viii. that this question be discussed.†

1. First of all, it must be admitted as a fact that the Scriptures recognize the dualism of spirit and matter, and that man is both material and immaterial, without any *tertium quid*, which is neither material nor immaterial. The presumption, then, is against the trichotomy, so far as it would ignore this fact. The presumption is also against any view which classes *soul* under the material part of the complex nature, since both soul and spirit are used to include the whole immaterial part of man.

On the other hand, Plato and Aristotle undoubt

* [Akin to the view under discussion is that of Göschel: "that the soul proceeds at once from body and spirit to unite the two" This contradicts, or, at least, confuses the immateriality of the soul, and makes a living body antecedent thereto. Hegelianism regards the soul as only the band that connects body and spirit.—R.]

* [Against so limited a view of ψυχή, see Tholuck, p. 302, who includes under it the νοῦς and ἔσω ἄνθρωπος. Comp. Irenæus, *c. hæres.*, v. 304.—R.]

† [On the trichotomy, see Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psych.*, pp. 84-98; Olshausen, *Romans*, pp. 271, 272, 2d ed.; *De naturæ hum. trichotomia*, &c., *Opuscc. Theol.*, Berlin, 1834, pp. 143 ff.; Messner, *Die Lehre des Apostel*, Leipsig, 1856, p. 207; Bishop Ellicott, *Sermon on the Destiny of the Creature;* Notes on 1 Thess. v. 23; Lange's *Comm. on Genesis*, pp. 213 f., 285 f.; Tholuck, *Romans*, pp. 288-302; J. B. Heard, *Tripartite Nature of Man*, 2d ed., Edinb., 1868; Lange, *Dogmatik*, pp. 307, 1243.—R.]

edly held that there was a trichotomy (for their views, see Delitzsch, p. 93; Eng. ed. p. 212). This fact may be used to explain 1 Thess. v. 23 as popular language, but "we must needs turn to the Holy Scriptures, and accept without prejudice what it answers to us, be it Platonic or anti-Platonic." Some such view was held by Origen, by the Apollinarians and semi-Pelagians. All these, like the modern rationalistic notions on the subject, were extenuations of human corruption. Vain speculations on the subject are abundant, but this should not be to the prejudice of truth.*

Turning to 1 Thess. v. 23, we find a distinct assumption of a tripartite nature in man, all the more weighty because it is not in didactic form. To say that this is merely popular language, does not meet the case. For, while it may be said that Paul does not profess to teach metaphysics, the question then recurs: Was the popular language of that day correct, or that of another age? Besides, it is a hazardous method of dealing with a writer so uncommonly exact, and with a book which concerns itself with human salvation. Experience has proven how largely the diffusion and acceptance of biblical truth are dependent on correct anthropological views. If we believe that Paul chose his words wittingly, much more, if we hold them to be inspired, this text, taken by itself, assumes "that in the original structure of man there is something—yet remaining, *needing and capable of sanctification*—corresponding to the three terms, *body*, *soul*, and *spirit*." † The same is implied in Heb. iv. 12.

Leaving these passages, we find little else in the New Testament to support this view. Of course, when accepted, it must modify to some extent the signification given to these terms in other places; but there is no other passage in the New Testament which could be relied on to prove the trichotomy were these absent. Hence we infer that the distinction, if real, is not of such importance as has been thought, and cannot be made the basis of the startling propositions which human speculation has deduced from it. This does not deny that, from other sources, the trichotomy may receive important support; it refers simply to the place it should take in biblical psychology. Judging from the rare allusions to it, the prevailing dichotomic tone of the Scriptures, we infer that, while it may be necessary, in order to explain these passages, to accept a trichotomy, the advantages of so doing are incidental, rather than of the first moment.‡

2. Admitting that there is a tripartite nature in man, the main difficulty is a precise definition of these three parts. Here the German authors are in a very Babel of confusion. For the sake of clearness, we first of all reject

(*a.*) All views of the human spirit which make it the real soul over against a brute soul, termed ψυχή, for the reasons given above under II.

(*b.*) All views of the human spirit which make it a higher *unfallen* part of man's nature, over against a soul under the power of the σάρξ. This which is the view of Olshausen, and, with modifications, of many others, is not borne out by the anthropology of Scripture; is contradicted by the very passages which alone can establish a trichotomy, and is in the very face of 2 Cor. vii. 1, where "filthiness," μολυσμός, defilement, stain, is attributed to the human spirit. Did such an unfallen *spirit*, in any sense, exist in man, we might expect that term to be used in this chapter instead of νοῦς and ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος, whatever the reference may be. Jul. Müller (i. p. 450) well remarks: "Πνεῦμα in this anthropological sense is itself exposed to pollution (2 Cor. vii. 1), and needs sanctification and cleansing just as ψυχή and σῶμα (1 Thess. v. 23; 1 Cor. vii. 34); this spiritual sphere of life is the one which, in the work of regeneration, most needs to be renewed (Eph. iv. 23, compared with Rom. xii. 2). The notion that man's spirit cannot be depraved—that it is only limited in its activity from without—and that sin is the consequence of this limitation, cannot be attributed to the Apostle." This excludes, also, the view of Schöberlein and Hofmann (since given up by him), that the third term of the trichotomy is "the Spirit of God immanent in the soul."

(*c.*) But this would also exclude the view of Philippi, Schmid (apparently of Tholuck, *Romans*, p. 301), that the third term is the pneumatic nature imparted to the believer at regeneration. If it be this, how can it need sanctification? Besides, this involves the theory of regeneration, which makes it the impartation of an entirely new nature, not *in* soul and body, but *in addition to* soul and body, as the third term in the complex being. This view cannot satisfactorily explain the trichotomy in 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. iv. 12.

(*d.*) There remains, then, this view, which meets all the requirements of exegesis: that man has a body in vital connection with his soul, which latter term includes all the powers of mind and heart, having as their object the world and self (hence including νοῦς and ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος in this chapter). That, besides, he has, in his unity of nature, a *spirit* which is of the same nature as the soul, of a higher capacity, yet not separated or separable from it. This spirit is the capacity for God, God-consciousness (Heard); but in man's present condition it is dormant, virtually dead in its depravity, needing the power of the Holy Spirit to renew it. After such renewal it becomes *spirit* in the sense intended in the proposition: "that which is born of the Spirit is *spirit*" (John iii. 6) This seems to be, in substance, the view of Müller, Delitzsch, and Heard.* It admits a dichotomy, and also a trichotomy; claims that the soul is spiritual rather than material; that there is no gulf between soul and spirit; that the human spirit is powerless for good, yet that here, where depravity is really most terrible, redemption begins. "In consequence of sin, the human spirit is absorbed into soul and

* [The anthropology of Swedenborg assumes a trinity rather than a trichotomy, and by his doctrine of correspondences, *spirit* seems to lose its real significance.—R.]

† [It must be noted how this passage assumes (1.), that the spirit needs sanctification; (2.) that body and soul are also to be preserved for God; thus guarding against Pelagianism and rationalism on the one hand, and asceticism and mysticism on the other.—R.]

‡ [Any argument from the analogy of the Trinity must be left out of view, since it can prove nothing, though it may be pleasing to some minds to trace such an analogy.—R.]

* [Of course, the term will be given a more or less extended meaning by different authors; but if the two positions be held fast: (1.) That this spirit is the point of contact with Divine influences; (2.) That it, too, has been depraved, all erroneous conclusions will be avoided. Dr. Lange (*Genesis*, p. 213) seems to coincide with the view here presented: "It must be held fast, that man could not receive the Spirit of God, if he were not himself a spiritual being; yet it is a supposition of the Scripture, that, since the fall, the spiritual nature is bound in the natural man, and does not come to its actuality."—R.]

flesh, and man, who ought to pass over from the position of the ψυχὴ ζῶσα into the position of the πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν, has become, instead of πνευματικός, a being ψυχικός and σαρκικός; and further, just for that reason, because the spirit stands in immediate causal relation to God, all the Divine operations having redemption in view, address themselves first of all to the πνεῦμα, and thence first attain to the ψυχή; for when God manifests himself, He appeals to the spirit of man" (*Bibl. Psych.*, p. 96, Eng. ed., p. 117). It may be urged that this presents no real distinction; I reply, that it is not claimed that the distinction is of essential importance. But as Paul uses the word πνεῦμα in preference to ψυχή, when he speaks of man's immaterial nature, especially as regenerated by the Spirit of God, there seems to be no other way of accounting for it except on this view. (The objections to that of Philippi have been considered above.) Delitzsch very properly remarks: "Should any prefer to say, that the Apostle, by πνεῦμα and ψυχή, is distinguishing the internal condition of man's life, and especially of the Christian's life, in respect of two several relations, even this would not be false." It is, indeed, the nearest expression of the truth; for the human spirit is not brought into any special prominence by Paul, save as in a given relation in the Christian's life. Hence we have a second meaning of πνεῦμα.

B. *The human spirit as acted upon by the Holy Spirit*, and thus becoming the seat of those Divine impulses, which are the means of redeeming the whole man. Of course, as opinions differ respecting the first meaning, they will vary from our definition. Philippi makes this identical with A, while others would claim that we should distinguish here rather a new principle of life (Lange), than a part of our renewed nature. Dr. Lange seems to prefer this meaning throughout chap. viii. There, however, the reference seems to be mainly to the Holy Spirit, the objective agent. In vers. 10, 16, the subjective meaning is undoubtedly the correct one, as in John iii. 6; iv. 23, 24 (so Rom. ii. 29, see p. 115, where Dr. Lange gives a different view), 1 Cor. vi. 17; Phil. iii. 3. In many other passages this meaning is implied, as indeed it is even in 1 Thess. v. 23, though this cannot be explained satisfactorily, without presupposing a human spirit antecedent to regeneration.

C. The most common use of the term is obviously the strictly theological one: the Holy Spirit. Opinions vary as to the propriety of this meaning in certain passages. No definite rule can be laid down. The absence of the article is by no means a certain indication that the reference is subjective (against Harless). The reason for preferring this meaning, rather than "spiritual life-principle" (Lange), in chap. viii., is that, in ver. 2, the Holy Spirit is undoubtedly referred to, over against sin and death. When, then, σάρξ afterwards occurs as the antithesis to πνεῦμα, there is still more reason for taking the latter term as the Holy Spirit, since the σάρξ is, as it were, personified and externalized, and the correct antithetical term must be an objective agent. We can thus far more definitely fix the meaning of σάρξ, since to admit any subjective antithesis, compels us to admit also some remnant of unfallen nature in the subject, for which the use of the word πνεῦμα in the New Testament gives no ground whatever.

IV. Σάρξ, FLESH. This term is used by the LXX. to translate the Hebrew word בָּשָׂר. This Hebrew word, in its simplest meaning, is applied to the material substance of the body, then occasionally to the human body itself. Out of this grows the application to all terrestrial beings who possess sensational life. But a more frequent use is in the sense of human nature, with the personal life attached to it (Gen. vi. 12; Deut. v. 26; Ps. lxxviii. 39; cxliv. 21; Isa. xlix. 26; lxvi. 16, 23, 24, and in numerous other passages). In Deut. v. 26; Isa. xxxi. 3; Jer. xvii. 5; Ps. lvi. 5, human nature is contrasted with God, His Spirit, eternity, and omnipotence, and the more prominent thought is therefore "that of the weakness, the frailty, the transitoriness of all earthly existence" (J. Müller). We reach, then, this sense: "Man with the adjunct notion of frailty" (Tholuck). There does not appear, however, any distinct ethical sense, still less any implication that man's sensuous nature is the seat of sin, or of opposition to his spirit.

1. Passing to the New Testament, we find also the narrower physiological meaning (1 Cor. xv. 39; Eph. v. 29; in the phrase, "flesh and blood," Matt. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16; Eph. vi. 12). It is also used as = body, the sensational part of man's nature, in Rom. ii. 18; 1 Cor. v. 5; vii. 28; 2 Cor. iv. 11; vii. 1, 5; xii. 7, &c., the antithesis being spirit, or the immaterial part of man's nature, never, however, with a distinctly ethical import. The prevailing use of the word in the New Testament undoubtedly is, that which corresponds with the wider meaning of בָּשָׂר, *human nature*, sometimes, as Müller holds, with a reference to the earthly life and relations (Gal. ii. 20; 2 Cor. x. 3; Phil. i. 22, 24; Col. i. 22; Eph. ii. 15, and a number of other passages, where the whole earthly side of man's life are contrasted with his relation to God in Christ); but also in the sense of man, with the idea of frailty more or less apparent (Rom. iii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 29; Gal. ii. 16; Acts ii. 17, which is a citation of בָּשָׂר in this sense; John xvii. 2; Luke iii. 6). Here we must class those passages which refer to the human nature of Christ: John i. 14; Rom. i. 3; ix. 5;* 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 John iv. 2 (comp. p. 61). This list might be enlarged, but it is only necessary to establish the New Testament use of σάρξ in the wide sense of the Hebrew equivalent. Up to this point we find no distinct ethical meaning—only a basis for it.

2. *The ethical sense.* Our inquiry here is of a twofold nature. A. How much is included under the term? B. What is its precise significance?

A. How much is included under this term? (1.) If we choose a few passages where the ethical sense is admitted by all commentators, such as Rom. viii. 4, or vii. 14 (σάρκινος); viii. 8, and attempt to substitute "body," or "sensational nature," for σάρξ, it will be evident that such a meaning does not at all meet the case. It is not only contrary to the scriptural anthropology throughout, but in the passages themselves the antitheses are not of a character to justify it, especially in view of the wide meaning of σάρξ, already established. (2.) Nor can we limit it to the body and soul, and exclude the human spirit. It has already been shown how little prominence is given to this distinction in the New Testament, how

* [In Rom. viii. 3, where the term occurs three times, it is highly probable that in the last two cases this sense is the more correct one.—R.]

there is no evidence whatever that the spirit is not under the dominion of the sarcical tendency, but that, on the contrary, an immoral tendency is implied.* Nor will this view find support in the use of the adjective ψυχικός in an ethical sense as = σαρκικός; for in the only case where such an ethical sense is undoubted (1 Cor. ii. 14), the antithesis is not simply πνευματικός (applied to spiritual things and persons as proceeding from, or influenced by, the Holy Ghost), but also "the things of the Spirit of God." (3.) Whatever ethical sense is to be attributed to the word σάρξ, must include the whole man, body and soul, or body, soul, and spirit. This agrees with the scriptural delineations of human nature, the use of the word above referred to, and its usual antithesis, when the ethical meaning is intended, viz., the Spirit of God; never the human spirit irrespective of the influence of the Spirit of God. This antithesis is not always expressed, but it is invariably implied. (Comp. Rom. vii. 5; viii. 3, 4 ff.; Gal. iii. 3; v. 16, 17, 19, 24; vi. 8; Col. ii. 18, 23.) If it be claimed that, in Rom. vii. 18, 25, the expressed antithesis is, in the former case, the inward man (ver. 22), then we reply, that the real antithesis is stated in ver. 14: "spiritual," "carnal," and that, under the influence of this spiritual law, any antagonism to the σάρξ has been awakened. Of course, if the reference to the regenerate be admitted, this objection disappears. So in ver. 25, although νοῦς is the expressed antithesis, it is the νοῦς under the influence either of the Holy Spirit, or the spiritual law. Σάρξ, in its ethical sense, therefore, means, not merely an earthly or fleshly tendency, or direction of life, but the *whole human nature;* not, as Olshausen thinks, *so far as* it is separated from God, but *as* it is separated from God, body, soul, and spirit, as sinful. Being in the flesh, is being in an ungodly state, a state of sin. (This view has obtained from the times of Augustine until now, among the mass of theologians.)

B. What, then, is the precise significance of this ethical sense of σάρξ?

1. Its usual antithesis indicates what the Scripture doctrine of sin so strongly asserts, that human nature, thus described, has become *alienated from God.* As love to God is the only true moral impulse, apostasy from God is sin, and the natural, carnal condition, is thus to be regarded. The Decalogue, Rom. i. 5, are sufficient to support this position. In the law, holy, just, and good, love to God is the chief requirement; in Rom. i. 21, wilful rejection of God is described as the seed of all the vices, subsequently catalogued, ending in the most fearful sensual excesses; in Rom. v. 12–21, sin is described as entering through one man, through his act of disobedience, and this is the immediate cause of the carnal condition of humanity. Yet this does not exhaust the meaning; it is rather its negative expression.

2. The positive principle of sin and the ruling principle of the flesh is undoubtedly *selfishness,* for, God being rejected, some personal object is required by the human personality. It is found in self; its interests become paramount. This is not, however, very prominent in the ethical term under consideration, but must be assumed in order to reach the further idea which it involves.

* [Comp. Delitzsch, *Bib. Psych.*, pp. 374 f., Eng. ed., pp. 140 ff., against the view of Günther, that there is a fleshly soul in distinction from the spiritual soul.—R.]

3. The human nature, thus alienated from God with selfishness as its ruling principle, must, however, seek gratification. There is but one resource, *the creature.* As σάρξ means man in his entire earthly relations, which are relations to the creature, its moral significance must include *devotion to the creature,* if the use of the term is to be fully justified. This, then, implies slavery to the creature in the search for self-gratification. Carnality, then, is as truly the moral state of one absorbed in intellectual and æsthetic pursuits, as of one sunk in sensuality. But as sensuous and sensual are cognate terms, so we find, not only in the teachings of the Scripture, but in the history of humanity, that the development of selfish devotion to the creature is in the direction of sensuality (fleshly sins, in a narrower sense). "Without God," has, as its positive expression, "in the world" (Eph. ii. 12). And the very want of satisfaction in worldly things leads to ever fiercer longing after the creature, to sin in its lowest forms. Sinking God in the material, or natural world, over which He rules, is, in effect, sinking man into the deepest slavery to the creature. To be "in the flesh," is therefore to be under "the law of sin and death." Sin is not, in its essence, devotion to the sensuous, nor is carnality essentially sensuality, but toward these as their manifestations they inevitably tend. We thus guard against both asceticism and materialism.

Flesh is, then, *the whole nature of man, turned away from God, in the supreme interest of self, devoted to the creature.* It is obvious that this is biblical, in linking together godliness and morality, ungodliness and sin, in implying both the inability of the law, and the necessity of the renewing influence of the Holy Spirit, in order to human holiness. Hence the propriety of the choice of this term to express man's sinful nature in this part of the Epistle, where sanctification and glorification are the themes.

On σάρξ, see J. Müller, *Christliche Lehre von der Sünde,* especially pp. 434 ff.; Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychologie,* pp. 373 ff.; Tholuck, *Römerbrief,* pp. 288 ff.; Wieseler, *Galaterbrief,* pp. 443 ff. (a very clear discussion); Lange's commentary on *Galatians,* p. 142, Amer. ed. This list might be increased by referring to works on Doctrinal Theology and Ethics, but it is limited to discussions of an exegetical character.—R.]

THIRD PARAGRAPH, VERS. 14–23.

The Sinner in relation to the Law.

Ver. 14. **For we know.** Οἴδαμεν, not οἶδα μέν (Jerome, &c.). [The former reading is almost universally adopted. Dr. Hodge, who inclined to the latter in earlier editions, now rejects it, on the ground that there is no δέ to correspond with μέν. The singular would imply that the subject was aware of the spiritual nature of the law at the time of the conflict; hence it would favor the reference to the regenerate. The plural, *we know,* simply means that Christians recognize this.—R.]

That the law is spiritual [ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστιν]. It is the specific knowledge peculiar to Christians that religion is inwardness; that the law is incorrectly understood, when it is changed by the σάρξ of external feeling into a σάρξ of external precepts—a complication of finite objects, while its nature is of a spiritual character;

that is, revealing in every tittle the infinity of God's Spirit, and relating to the Spirit. The *γάρ* declares the stiff-necked and malignant nature of sin. The law is *γράμμα* only in form; its nature is divine and spiritual (Meyer). Explanations:

1. Inspired by the Holy Spirit (Theodoret).

2. Requiring a heavenly and angelic righteousness (Calvin).

3. Relating to the higher spiritual nature of man in different applications, by Beza, Reiche, De Wette, and Rückert).

4. *In suo genere præclarum et egregium* (Koppe, and others).

5. The spiritual, and not the literal sense of the law, is meant (Origen).

6. Operating spiritually, *διδάσκαλος ἀρετῆς*, &c. (Chrysostom).

7. Presupposing the presence of the Spirit as the condition of its fulfilment (Tholuck).

8. Identical in its spirit with that of the Holy Spirit (Meyer). *Πνευματικός* describes its *whole spirituality* (James ii. 10), the absolute unity of its origin, its elements, and its purpose in the Divine Spirit (which reveals itself in the human spirit), in contrast with the presupposition of its finite force, its finite and sundered parts of membership, and its finite design. [The view of Meyer is the simplest and best: *in its nature it is divine.* (So Hodge.) This undoubtedly accords best with the antithesis, *σάρκινος, made of flesh.*—R.]

But I am carnal [*ἐγὼ δὲ σάρκινός εἰμι.* See *Textual Note* [4], and below.] The *ἐγώ*, in accordance with the *ἰδίωσις* mentioned above, is Paul himself, in the exhibition of his standpoint under the law, for the exhibition of the historical development of man standing under the law. Meyer: "The still undelivered *ἐγώ*, which, in the great need that presses upon it in opposition to the law, groans for deliverance;" ver. 24. The same writer properly maintains, against Philippi, that the subject is identical through the entire section. On the other hand, Meyer incorrectly distinguishes the past tenses of vers. 7–13, and the present tenses of vers. 14 ff., by saying that, in the former case, Paul has described his psychological history before and under the law, and in the latter, that he portrays his nature standing in opposition to the spiritual character of the law. But down to ver. 13 he has rather portrayed the genesis of the really internal and legal standpoint. But after ver. 14, he describes the whole development of this standpoint; that is, the inward conflict of the sinner who has perceived the inward character of the law.

Carnal (*fleischern*). *Σάρκινος*, made of flesh, like flesh (2 Cor. iii. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 1). The word could also be translated *fleshly*, if this were not a conventional term for *carnally minded*, *σαρκικός*. Meyer thinks that *σάρκινος* "gives a deeper shade" than *σαρκικός*, with reference to John iii. 6; but the case is about the reverse, since we must understand by *σαρκικός*, *carnally minded*, and by *σάρκινος*, carnally formed, inclined, and disposed; a being whose natural spontaneity and view of things are external, according to the *σάρξ*. (On the opposition of the readings, comp. Tholuck, p. 368.)*

The *σάρκινος* is immediately afterwards explained as:

Sold under sin [*πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίαν*]. On the one hand, this state of slavery declares the complete subjection of the sinner to sin; but, on the other, we must not overlook his *unwillingness* and *opposition* to his being sold. This will probably be the case, if, with Tholuck and Meyer, we regard the *σάρκινος* merely as a higher degree of *σαρκικός*. Therefore Tholuck regards Bengel's expression as too refining: *Servus venditus miserior est quam verna, et venditus dicitur homo, quia ab initio non fuerat servus.* Meyer correctly observes, that this opinion is in conflict with Augustine's explanation of the passage, as referring to the regenerate. Similar passages, 2 Kings xvii. 17; 1 Mac. i. 15.

Revelation of the obscuration of perception (vers 15, 16).

Ver. 15. **For that which I perform I know not** [*ὃ γὰρ κατεργάζομαι οὐ γινώσκω*]. There is wanting in this condition the authority of the conscious spirit; but the consciousness of this want has made its appearance. Meyer calls up the analogy of the slave, who acts as the instrument of his master, without knowing the real nature and design of what he does. But this slave here is not altogether in such a condition, for he knows at least that he cannot effect (*πράσσω*) what he will, or would like, and that he rather does (*ποιῶ*) what he hates. Thus one thing dawns upon him—that he acts in gloomy self-distraction, and in contradiction of a better but helpless desire and repugnance. The sense of the passage is removed, if, with Augustine, Beza, Grotius, and others, we explain *γινώσκω* to be *I approve of.** (Appeal to Matt. vii. 23; John x. 14; 2 Tim. ii. 19, and elsewhere.) Here, moreover, the emphasis does not yet rest on the *θέλειν* (which Tholuck applies to a mere *velleitas*, and Meyer to a real and decided wish, but which, after all, remains only theory!) and *μισεῖν*, but on the *οὐ γινώσκω*.

[**For not what I wish, that I practise; but what I hate, that do I.** *Οὐ γὰρ ὃ θέλω, τοῦτο πράσσω, ἀλλ' ὃ μισῶ, τοῦτο ποιῶ.* Although *γάρ* is explanatory of the preceding clause, there seems to be an advance here, a step toward the light of self-knowledge.—The meaning of *θέλω* is open to discussion. It means, *I will* (within the sphere of spontaneity, Dr. Hitchcock claims). The two questions to be decided are:

* [The Greek adjectives ending in -ινος (with the accent on the antepenult) describe the material out of which any thing is made (comp. the English -*en*, wooden, earthen). Σάρκινος is therefore *carneus*, made of flesh; *σαρκικός*, *carnalis*, *fleshly*, of this character. Adopting the former reading, three modes of view present themselves: (1.) That the Apostle has here purposely chosen the stronger word (so Meyer), and thus a reference to the regenerate, spiritual man is necessarily excluded. (2.) That here, *σάρκινος* is = *σαρκικός*. (So Lange.) This is also adopted in the interest of the reference to the believer. (3.) Delitzsch even finds the former the weaker word: "*σάρκινος* is one who has in himself the bodily nature and the sinful tendency inherited with it; but *σαρκικός* is one whose personal fundamental tendency is this sinful impulse of the flesh." I prefer (1.); but (3.) should be adopted by those who insist on the Augustinian view. Otherwise, the first time the present tense, upon which so much stress is laid as indicating a change in the state of the subject, occurs, the predicate must be tampered with, and made to mean, not simply, *I am carnal*, but, *I was, I am so to a certain extent, I am still carnal, though not as formerly.* Dr. Hodge deems the extreme (*i. e.*, simple) sense of the words, "inconsistent with the context," but the immediate context has to be limited in the same way to make this applicable, especially exclusively applicable, to a regenerate person.—R.]

* [This interpretation is altogether untenable on philological grounds. Dr. Hodge justifies it, by saying: "With regard to moral objects, knowledge is not mere cognition. It is the apprehension of the moral quality, and involves, of necessity, approbation or disapprobation." But a correct inference is not always a correct interpretation.—R.]

(1.) Has it here a reference to *the will* in the strict sense (either = *velleitas*, Tholuck, and others, or = a full determination of the will, Philippi); or does it mean, I *desire, wish?* The former is, perhaps, favored by the psychological character of the whole passage; but the latter is preferable, since μισῶ is so opposed, that both words must be referred to the same faculty; and it is easier to class θέλω within the region of the emotions, than to transfer μισῶ to that of the will. (2.) How intense is its meaning? Here μισῶ is undoubtedly in itself a stronger word. Perhaps the use of two different verbs (πράττω, ποιῶ) in the main clauses would justify a difference of intensity in the antithetical verbs θέλω, μισῶ (*i. e.*, the desire for good is less strong than the hatred of evil); or μισῶ may be taken as = οὐ θέλω (*I do not wish*). Ver. 16 strongly favors the latter. Either of these views is preferable to that which strengthens the antithesis into *I love, I hate* (Hodge). For this forces a meaning upon θέλω which the Apostle could have expressed far more plainly by another term.—R.]

The wish here is the better desire and effort of the man awakened to his inward state. First of all, the sinner becomes a gloomy enigma to himself in the contradictions of his doing and leaving undone. (See Meyer on the odd explanation of Reiche, that the sinful Jew does the wickedness which the sinless Jew does not approve of. Also on statements kindred to the foregoing, in Epictetus: ὃ μὲν θέλει (ὁ ἁμαρτάνων) οὐ ποιεῖ, καὶ ὃ μὴ θέλει, ποιεῖ; and in Ovid: *Video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor*. Still other examples in Tholuck, p. 366.) On Philippi's interpretation of this passage as applicable to the regenerate, see Tholuck, p. 355.* The choice of the expressions is very delicate; from the real θέλειν in spirit he does not come to the consistent and vigorous πράσσειν; but even the μισεῖν cannot prevent a weaker ποιεῖν of the rebellious one.

Ver. 16. **But if what I wish not, that I do** [εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ θέλω, τοῦτο ποιῶ. Δέ is perhaps logical, and marks a step in self-discovery with respect to the law.—R.] The mental consent to the law now appears above the perceived dissension between willing and doing. As the sinner places himself, with his judgment, on the side of his awakened will, he places himself, with his judgment, on the side of the law.

[**I agree with the law that it is good,** σύμφημι τῷ νόμῳ ὅτι καλός. The verb may not here imply more than an intellectual acquiescence in the high moral character of the law, yet that acquiescence extends as far as the θέλειν. That this *must* be actual in the case of an *awakened* man, is evident. How, else, could the sense of sin arise?—R.] This is the first step on the way of self-knowledge: Acquiescence in the law in opposition to his own actions. But at the same time, the law is acknowledged to be good in an eminent sense, as noble, standing ideally above the life—καλός. Meyer: "The usual construction, *I grant that the law is good*, neglects the συν." Against the reference of the τῷ νόμῳ to συν, see Tholuck; see him also for quotations from Chrysostom and Hugo St. Victor on the innate nobility of the soul.

The illumination of the darkness of the will (vers. 17, 18).

Ver. 17. **Now then it is no longer I that perform it** [νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτό. Νυνί is logical, not temporal (so all modern commentators). If temporal, then it might mark the transition into a state of grace The same is true of οὐκέτι. See Winer, p. 574 "Since I consent to the law, that it is good, *it can no longer be affirmed that I*," &c. (Meyer).—R.] Tholuck: "*Nuni Aug. nunc in statu gratiæ*—rather a designation of the inference." But it denotes not merely a continued movement in the treatment, but also in the subject discussed. The understanding has first entered upon the side of the law; now this is done also by the real will of the *ego*. The sinner distinguishes between his *ego*—which now emerges from the darkness of the personality—and the sin [the principle of sin personified] dwelling in him—now like a foreign and wicked co-habitant. He places himself, with his *ego* and his will, on the side of the law, and abjures the bad part of his condition. The ἐγώ, as well as the κατεργάζομαι, must be emphasized. The αὐτό is that which he, according to ver. 16, now no more wills with his real will. [As yet, however, there is no indication that this state of things *does* or *can* lead to "what is good," save in powerless desire, even if, with Meyer, we take the *ego* here as = the moral self-consciousness. Ver. 18 acknowledges this.—R].

But sin dwelling in me [ἀλλὰ ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία]. The Apostle distinguishes between the ἐγώ and an individuality in a wider sense, described by *in me*, in which sin dwells. [Stuart takes *in me* as referring, not to the wider individuality, but to the carnal self, which here begins to appear over against the better self. It may be doubted whether there is such a better self as is referred to in the first clause of this verse, in the unregenerate man. But all men under the law feel such a discord as this.—As the attributing of the *doing* to indwelling sin by the Christian is not a denial of responsibility, so, in the case of one not yet a Christian, it is not the assumption of a power to do right. There is no sign of release as yet. Even if we limit *in me* to the narrower sense it has in ver. 18, the whole personality seems to be under the power of sin.—Wordsworth finds here, and in the succeeding verses, a vindication of God from the charge of being the author of sin!—R.]

Ver. 18. **For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, good doth not dwell** [οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ οἰκεῖ ἐν ἐμοί, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, ἀγαθόν. *For I know*, is regarded by Philippi as an expression of Christian consciousness; yet some such consciousness is the very result which the law is designed to produce.—R.] More special definition of the dwelling of sin in him. This arises from the fact that good does not dwell in him—that is, in his flesh. The negative expression is noteworthy: If in a moral being no good dwells, the opposite (sin) does dwell in him. The σάρξ is here established as the other side of the *ego*, which, with this, constitutes the whole man. But we cannot identify the σάρξ, either with the

* [Dr. Hodge is certainly correct in saying, "that every Christian can adopt the language of this verse;" but when Alford (following Philippi) asserts, that *no such will exists in the carnal, unregenerate man*, the remark is incorrect, unless θέλω be referred either to a full determination of the will, or to the strongest possible desire. That neither of these is a necessary conclusion, is evident not only from the language of Epictetus, but from the close connection with ver. 14 (γάρ . . . γάρ), as well as from ver. 16, where οὐ θέλω is evidently used as explaining μισῶ. It is a gratuitous inference, that a reference of this verse to the unregenerate implies a contradiction of the depravity of the human will.—R.]

body, or with the lusts of the body alone (the Greek fathers). Tholuck cites, in favor of this view, the different expressions, "in my members," "body of death," ver. 24. But these terms must not be understood materially. The σάρξ is the external, finite nature and mode of relation and view; it is the finite tendency in both its immaterial and sensuous character, which certainly has its substantial basis in the external σάρξ. Calvin interprets σάρξ here as human nature. It would be better to say: in my naturalness.

[See, on σάρξ, the Excursus above. The word may be here used in the physiological sense (Wieseler). But this seems strangely out of place. It is assumed to escape the difficulty that arises, if the reference to the unregenerate be held. In the case of a Christian, the limitation is made, because he has a spiritual nature, over against his carnal nature, in which good does dwell. But since σάρξ, in the ethical sense, includes the whole natural man, why should any limitation be made, if the reference be to the unregenerate? The grave objection must be admitted; but if the verse be referred to the regenerate man, why this studious avoidance of mentioning the πνεῦμα? and why such a powerlessness as is expressed in the next clause? The only satisfactory explanation is, that the distinction between unregenerate and regenerate is not in question, but the man of the law is here represented as conscious of being σάρκινος, made so more fully by the conflict which the law has awakened. The immediate antithesis (which is not strongly marked here) is simply the better desire, the *ego* longing to be better, powerless, however, *in every case*, until escaping from the law to Christ; yet this implies, as the real ethical antithesis, the spiritual law here acting on the man.—R.] The Apostle's declaration is far removed from the Flacian, Gnostic, and Manichean definitions. He could not have sought a real "moral willing and doing" (Meyer) as "good" in his "flesh," but only religious morality and excellence. But he does not even find this in it; and hence there arises the contrary propensity, a pseudo-plastic will of the flesh.

For to will is present with me [τὸ γὰρ θέλειν παράκειταί μοι]. Not, "is present in me," as Meyer says, but who corrects himself when he also says: Paul represents the matter as if he were looking about after it in his personality—as if seeking himself in a spacious sphere. "The θέλειν is present with him—before his gaze." To will is immediately before his eyes, but he can nowhere find the treasure of performing that which is good.

[**To perform that which is good I find not,** τὸ δὲ κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν οὐχ εὑρίσκω. See *Textual Note* [7]. If the briefer reading be accepted, παράκειται must be supplied. The meaning is then obvious.—R.] Explanations: I do not *gain* it; I *can* not, &c. (Estius, Flatt, &c.). We must first emphasize the κατεργάζεσθαι, and secondly, the καλόν. The question is not concerning the *justitia civilis*, but the carrying out of the ideal. The ἐγώ is not yet the new man of the spirit (Philippi); it is the better self as an awakened moral will, from which the aim is removed and the way stopped up by the accustomed propensity of the flesh.

The revelation of the obscuration and dispension in the unconscious ground of life—that is, in the life of feeling (vers. 19, 20). According to Tholuck and Meyer, we have in these verses only proofs of the preceding. Meyer: Ver. 19 is a proof of ver. 18, and ver. 20 of ver. 17. [Stuart: "'If what I have said in vers. 18 and 19 be true, then what I have affirmed in ver. 17 must be true.'"—R.]

Ver. 19. [**For the good,** &c. Γάρ is confirmatory. "I find not," is proved by acts which are not according to the better desire. Dr. Hodge presses the meaning of θέλω. That Paul, *as a Christian*, would mean more by these words than Seneca or Epictetus, is undoubtedly true; but whether he does mean more than is true *in every case*, to a certain extent, of a man awakened under the law, is very doubtful.—R.]—**But the evil which I wish not, that I practise,** ὃ οὐ θέλω κακόν, τοῦτο πράσσω. This strong expression is new. It points to a fountain of wicked action which proceeds immediately from the unconscious life in opposition. And this is the darkness of the sensuous [the carnal] life.

Ver. 20. [**Now if I do that I would not,** εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ θέλω ἐγώ, τοῦτο ποιῶ. *Εἰ δὲ* = *since, then*, hypothetical only in form. On ἐγώ, see *Textual Note* [8]. There is undoubtedly a progress in thought. Alford thinks the *ego* is here perceived to be the better *ego* of the inward man; but this progress is perceptible in the case of the awakened, only, however, to produce the cry of ver. 24.—R.] This verse, then, specifies also the real author of these actions of the man against his will: it is sin **dwelling in me** [ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία], the habitual life of sense [*i. e.*, of the flesh]. This, in its obscurity, he now renounces in his consciousness; in his *I*. But now, to a certain degree or apparently, a foreign personality with a foreign law arises in him, against the awakening personality of his inner man. [The condition is not in itself, as yet, more hopeful. The progress is still toward wretchedness, despite or even because of the better desire.—R.]

Disclosure of the inward rent in man in general; the dissension between the true personality and the false personality with its false law (vers. 21, 22).

Ver. 21. **I find then the law** [εὑρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον]. The difficulty of the passage has led Chrysostom to call it ἀσαφὲς εἰρημένον, and Rückert to give up its explanation.

Explanations: *a.* The *Mosaic law* is meant; ὅτι for *because*. "I find, then, the law for me, so far as I am willing to do good, because evil is present with me." That is, the law is designed for me, because I have the will to do good, but evil, &c. (Origen, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsvestia, Theophylact, Bengel, &c.; Meyer,* and even Ulfilas. See Tholuck's Note, p. 372: *Invenio nunc legem, volenti mihi bonum facere, nam mihi adest malum*). We may say, in favor of this, that it certainly describes also the origin of the law; that contradiction has made the law necessary.

Still, this exposition is thoroughly untenable.

1. Since the beginning—that is, from ver. 7—

* [Meyer (4th ed.) holds that the article requires us to understand the Mosaic law, but his view of the construction is as follows: *the law* is joined with the participle, the infinitive is the infinitive of design, and the last clause introduced by ὅτι is the object of *I find*: "I find, then, while my will is directed to the law in order to do good, that evil is present with me." As he well adds: "What deep misery!" But this seems forced, and is only an attempt to preserve consistently his *dictum*, that τὸν νόμον must mean the Mosaic law. See, however, his full grammatical justification.—R.]

the speaker has known that the law is appointed for him.

2. Here the question is no more concerning the law for the sinner, but the relation of the sinner to the law; the explanation is thus totally against the connection.

3. The explanation, *now I have discovered the law to be a law for me*, would be strange.

4. The law is previously for him also, whose willingness to do what is good has not yet developed, while the legal stage for the condition here described soon terminates. Hofmann's modification does not help the matter: That to do evil is ever present with me, shows me that the law is good to me, who am willing to do it. He has already said this more plainly in ver. 12. But, strictly, it is not yet decided here that the law is also good *to him*. Another view of the Mosaic law: I find, then, for me, who am willing to do the law, the good (namely, the law), that evil is present before me (Homberg, Knapp, Klee, Olshausen,* Fritzsche, &c.). Unimportant repetition of the foregoing. Likewise the ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν must not be separated.

b. "The law denotes here a general rule, a necessity." I find, then, for me, who am willing to do good—the law—that evil is present with me (Luther, Beza, Calvin, and many others; De Wette and Philippi [Stuart, Hodge]). Thus the sense would be the same as in the expression, ἕτερος νόμος ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι. Meyer remarks, on the other hand, that, according to the whole context, νόμος can be nothing else than the Mosaic law. Another law appears first in ver. 23. Also, the ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται could not be described as νόμος; it is something *empirical*—a *phenomenon*. But why, then, can the Apostle call even the motions in the members a law? Why can he call the old man, who is nevertheless not a man, a man?

Accepting this view in general, we may ask whether the sense is: I find in me, or, for me, willing to do good—the law, &c.—as formerly; or, I find the law, that, when I would do good, &c. (Grotius, Limborch, Winer).† This construction is decidedly preferable, because it suits the expression as well as the sense. For here the one law resolves itself even into a group of laws. The law of God now becomes to the Apostle the law of his *mind;* the foreign law in his members becomes in its effect the law of sin. But this antagonism of law to law is so fearfully strong, that it appears to the Apostle himself as in itself a law of moral contradiction; and this a terribly strong contradiction, for, just when he would do what is good, and high, and great (for example, protect the Old Testament theocracy), evil is present to him (persecution of the Christians). Therefore the one law is resolved into two.

[This view involves a slight trajection of ὅτι, and then the dative is not governed by εὑρίσκω, but an anacoluthon is accepted, which causes the repetition of ἐμοί. Though, in general, the view is the same as that of Luther and Calvin, yet *this law* is thus distinguished as neither the law of the mind nor the law in the members, but the contradiction of the two. Vers. 22, 23, taking up, as they do, the two sides of this contrariety, favor our view also. It may be added: (1.) The presence of the article does not decide that the Mosaic law is meant; for the article occurs in ver. 23, where it is certainly *not* meant. (2.) The article has a sufficiently demonstrative force (*this* law) without τοῦτον being inserted. (3.) The phrase, law *of God* (ver. 22), seems, by its definiteness, to point to another sense here. Our English version, therefore, presents the best sense.—R.]

Ver. 22. **For I delight in the law of God** [συνήδομαι γὰρ τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ. The γάρ introduces the two verses as an antithetical explanation of ver. 20. The συν in συνήδομαι is as in συλλυπούμενος, Mark iii. 5, after the analogy of σύνοιδά μοι = *apud animum* (Tholuck). No thought of delighting with, as Meyer holds. It is undoubtedly stronger than σύμφημι, ver. 16 (against Stuart). It belongs to the sphere of feeling. See further below.—R.] Tholuck: "The two contending forces in the one personality (ver. 17) are locally divided, one being in the inward man, the other in the outward members; the will is taken captive in the way from the inward to the outward man—that is, to the executing organs." But the powers named here assume a concrete form. The moral *judgment*, in vers. 15 and 16, the moral *will*, or the *I*, in vers. 17 and 18, and the moral *inwardness*, in vers. 19 and 20, have now become the *inner man*, who delights in the law of God. But just now sin in the members comes in, with the power of a strange law, so that a chasm pervades his whole being, in which even he, who at the beginning of the process was a slave, is now, in consequence of his helpless resistance, become a military captive of sin.

[**After the inward man**, κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον.] The ἔσω ἄνθρωπος is not so much the νοῦς or τὸ νοερόν (Theod. and Gaunad.) itself, as the man choosing in the νοῦς *his standpoint*, his principle (which is not really gained until the conclusion of ver. 25). It is also so far the inner man as that he withdraws almost desperately from the outwork of his external life. Lyra explains similarly to the Greek writers: *In homine duplex pars, ratio et sensualitas, quæ aliter nominantur caro et spiritus, homo interior et exterior*. This reminds us of the Platonic use of language: In Plato and Plotinus we find the *termini*, ὁ εἴσω ἄνθρωπος, ὁ ἐν τὸς ἄ., ὁ ἀληθὴς ἄ. Tholuck, on the other hand, understands by the ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρ., after the analogy of ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρ., ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδ. ἄ. (1 Peter iii. 4), rather the inward *I* of the man than a single attribute—the inward man, who permits himself to be controlled by his conscience, the man of conscience. But this does not remove the difficulty. For the question is not, that *the real and true man* is created for God; for this holds good of flesh and blood, ontologically considered. But it may be asked, What actual standpoint does the Apostle here denote? According to his antithesis, it is this: he distinguishes his inward nature, as the true man, from the antagonism and conflict of the law in his members. It is in this self-comprehension that he now has his delight in the law, which is more than the σύμφημι of ver. 16. Meyer also sees in the συνήδομαι, the law designated as also rejoicing with him; on which, see Tholuck, p. 367. Luther, Calvin, and others, have thought the new-born man here described. The standpoint here denoted is true as a point of transition, yet the dualists have erro

* [Olshausen (2d ed., p. 280) rejects this view as harsh; but what his precise opinion is, is not very obvious.—R.]

† [Winer (7th ed.) favors the other view (that of Luther), while Tholuck (5th ed.), Philippi (2d ed.), and apparently Olshausen (2d ed.), adopt this, which is that of the E. V. Our English and American commentaries combat many authors, who have already given up the opposed opinions on this verse.—R.]

seously attempted to establish it as theory and fundamental law.

[The strong expression, συνήδομαι, seems to indicate that the *inward man* is the *new man*, under the influence of the Spirit (see Philippi, Hodge, Alford *in loco*), but this view is beset with difficulties also. Why is this influence purposely kept in the background? Alford answers: To set the conflict in the strongest light. But that is not like Paul, who can hardly refrain from his references to grace in Christ. As a matter of fact, the conflict under the law produces a divided state, where something in the man does not only consent to the law, but, in aroused feeling, delights in the law. Such a state may be the result of *gratia præveniens*, or may always result in deliverance; but its present effect, as here described, is only "captivity," helplessness. An abnormal condition in the case of the Christian, though his *delight*, even in this introspective quasi-legal condition, is more pronounced. This *inward man*, independently of gracious influences, leads only to misery. Notice, too, that when, as here, an apparent reference to the Christian occurs, it is immediately followed by language that seems totally inapplicable to him. This confirms the view that this distinction is not prominent.—R.]

Ver. 23. **But I see another law** [βλέπω δὲ ἕτερον νόμον. Paul here represents himself as a looker-on upon his own personality (Meyer). Δέ adversative or disjunctive.—R.] His seeing indicates his *surprise*. Gal. i. 6 and 7 serves to explain how the ἕτερον is here distinguished from the ἄλλον. As there the ἕτερον εὐαγ. is not a true gospel, so this ἕτερος νόμος is not a true νόμος. How could the *one* real law of God be in perpetual conflict with the other? [As indicated above (ver. 21), this is not the law there found, but that law is the rule of contradiction between the two here referred to.—R.]

In my members [ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί μου. This is to be joined with νόμον, rather than with the participle ἀντιστρατ.—R]. Namely, operative in my members. Fritzsche construes thus: Which opposes in my members. Incorrectly: For the conflict is not decided in the members. The σάρξ, which, being spiritually disordered, has become the basis of the desires, has its essence in its dismemberment, in the division of its members; therefore the false law is operative in the members.*

[**Warring against the law of my mind,** ἀντιστρατευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου. The form νοός belongs to later Greek (Meyer). See Winer, p. 61.—R.] Earlier, this law was master, and the ἐγώ servant; now, after the ἐγώ has become distinct from the sinful σάρξ as the inner man of himself, sin carries on a formal war by the members, but with the force of a law which it describes as the law of nature, or one similar to it. Simultaneously with the fact that the combatant has recognized the Mosaic law again as the expression of his inward steadiness, and has made it the νόμος of his νοῦς, of his personal consciousness, sin has assumed the semblance of a law of nature dominant in the members.

[**And bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.** See *Textual Note* *. The participle αἰχμαλωτίζοντα (later Greek: to take by the spear in war, *to take prisoner*) is very strong.—R.] Sin, in this semblance, opposes the inward man, and conquers him; the **I** finds itself the captive of another law, which now audaciously appears as the law of sin; that is, sin will now assert itself as an insurmountable fatality.—Meyer will not accept the genitive νόμος τοῦ νοός as subjective, but local. He would distinguish it further from the νόμος τοῦ θεοῦ (against Usteri, Köllner, &c.), without observing that "the law of God" has reproduced itself in "the law of the mind." [The difference is thus expressed by Bengel: *dictamen mentis meæ lege divina delectatæ.* There seems to be two pairs of laws here, each pair closely related: The law of God, with its answering law in the mind (taken locally); the law in the members, subservient and causing subserviency to the law of sin. The parallelism is not strict, for the conflict is evoked by the law of God, and ends in the law of sin. It is unlikely that this is a peculiarly Christian state.—R.]

The νοῦς denotes the thinking and moral consciousness, which constitutes the essence of personality. [Meyer: "the reason in its practical activity." Olshausen, and others, find here the organ of the unfallen spirit; the Augustinian interpreters, the organ of the renewed man, the spiritual nature; all agree that it answers to the *inward man* (ver. 22). If that means renewed nature, we would expect here some expression of the Spirit's influence. The choice of another word, as well as of another phrase than "the law of God" here, where it would seem so appropriate were the reference to a Christian, confirms the view held throughout in our exegesis. —R.]

Meyer says further: The inward man is not brought into captivity, for he, considered in and of himself, always remains in the service of God's law (ver. 25); but the apparent man is. Then the warfare would be carried on by the apparent man! It is indeed correct, that in τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας the dative is not instrumental (according to Chrysostom, and others), but is *dat. commodi.**

On the different distinctions between the law in the members and the law of sin, see Meyer, p. 288 (Köllner: Demands of the desires, and the desires themselves). We distinguish between the first *appearance* and the *final manifestation:* The law in the members passes itself off for, or appears to the sinner first as, the law of nature; therefore it brings him into captivity, and appears to him finally as the law of sin—the law of anomy, of unnaturalness. Pareus' understanding of the μέλη as the *pars nondum regenita*, coincides with the reference to the new-born man. When Calovius and Socinius held that the *facultates interiores* are included, they intimated that not the μέλη of itself, but only in connection with spiritual dispositions, could form the semblance of another and wicked law.

FOURTH PARAGRAPH (VERS. 24, 25).

The Transition from the Law to the Gospel.

It is a characteristic of the interpretation of this passage, that some have made vers. 24 and 25 paren-

* [Philippi holds that "members" here has a meaning between the physiological and ethical. Hodge makes it = in my flesh; but the phrase seems purposely chosen to indicate the locality where the opposing law is most *evident*, rather than its precise seat.—R.]

* [If ἐν be accepted in the text, then this would not be instrumental, but describe the department in which the taking captive has place (Alford). —R.]

thetical down to ἡμῶν; Grotius and Flatt, ver. 25 to ἡμῶν. Tholuck: "As, in the case of the morally fickle, such an experience, daily renewed, calls forth the renunciatory exclamation to virtue, 'Thou art too hard for me; take away my crown, and let me sin,' so, from the morally earnest warrior, is there called forth the cry of distress for deliverance and the power of victory." He adds to this: "Knight Michaelis gives this cry of distress a very moderate sound: 'It is the lamentation of a distressed Jew which Paul answers thus: I thank God that I do not have to lament so.'"—But the deeply moral warrior, who has once arrived at this degree, does not readily turn back. De Wette says, very pertinently: "From what has occurred, there now follows the need of deliverance, which has been satisfied by the grace of God."

Ver. 24. **O wretched man** [*Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος*]. *Ταλαίπωρος*, strictly, *exhausted by hard labor* (τλῆναι πῶρος, *callum pati*). Similar to the expressions in Matt. xi. 28. [The nominative is the nominative of exclamation (Philippi, Meyer). The word occurs only here and Rev. iii. 17 (of the Laodicean church); there joined with ἐλεεινός, to which it is almost equivalent in popular usage. The corresponding verb occurs in James iv. 9, and the noun, Rom. iii. 16; James v. 1. From these passages it would seem that here the prominent idea is of helplessness and misery; the cry for help from without follows. Bengel is certainly incorrect: "*me miserum, qui homo sim!*"—R.] It is the desperate cry for personal righteousness, and also of the completed repentance now about to be transformed into faith—but a faith which the law cannot give. Repentance asks, faith responds. (Reiche's explanation: The cry of Jewish humanity for help, to which a delivered one responds in chap. viii. 1. With this view, the passage from εὐχαριστῶ to ἡμῶν is said to be a gloss.)

Who shall deliver me [*τίς με ῥύσεται*. Simple future. Not = would that I were delivered. Calvin thinks it expresses no doubt, but only the absence of the deliverance at the time. Yet Olshausen seems nearer right in making it imply: who *can*, with a reference to a *personal* deliverer.—R.] *Ῥύομαι*, Septuagint for גָּאַל, הוֹשִׁיעַ, &c. It refers both to the fundamental deliverance (as in the present passage), and to the continued and final deliverance; Matt. vi. 13. [Comp. Col. i. 13, where the reference is to a definite act of deliverance.—R.]

From this body of death? [*Ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου*;]. Explanations: Connection of the *τούτου* with *σώματος*.

1. The *universitas vitiorum* (Ambrose, Calvin); *mors velut corpus quasi res per se subsistens* (Piscator, Crell). As the Rabbinical גּוּף *corpus mortis pro ipsa morte* (Socinius, Schöttgen). Wolf: *mortifera peccata massa*. Flatt: The system of sensuous affections, which is the cause of death. Tholuck observes, against these explanations: But the reader will suppose that σῶμα is meant in no other sense than as σῶμα ἁμαρτίας, τὸ θνητὸν σῶμα; chap. vi. 12. We have already remarked, however, that these two ideas are radically different. The explanation before us needs, however, a more exact proof.

2. The same connection of the *τούτου* with *σώματος*. The sense: *Mortal body*. *a.* Longing for death (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Erasmus, Koppe, and others), according to Meyer. Tholuck, on the other hand, thus sets him right: They have not intended, on the negative side, the wish for deliverance from the body of death, but, on the positive side, the wish for the glorification and clothing-upon of the body. *b.* Olshausen: the spirit would like to make the mortal body living, &c.

3. Death as a monster personified with a body, which threatens to swallow up the ἐγώ (Reiche).

Connection of the *τούτου* with *θανάτου*.

From the body of this death. (Vulgate, Ulfilas, Luther, Fritzsche, De Wette, Tholuck, Meyer.) [So E. V., Hodge, Alford, Jowett.] *a.* θάνατος is the same as *vitiositas* (Calvin, and others). *b.* "He means here that death is the misery and labor endured in conflict with sin" (Luther); *c.* De Wette: Who will deliver me from the body of this death? that is, from the body which, in consequence of sin dwelling or reigning in it, is subject to death and misery. Reference to 2 Cor. v. Fritzsche similarly. *d.* Meyer gives as much as two explanations: Who will deliver me, so that then I shall be no more dependent upon the body, "which serves as the seat for so ignominious a death?" Or, in other words: "Who will deliver me from dependence upon the law of sin to moral freedom, so that then my body will no more serve as the seat of so ignominious a death?" If we understand the body to be a real body, with all these contortions, we do not find our way out of the external desire of death.

Of the expositors under 1, Krehl approaches nearest to our view. The "body" is the organism of sin. [The most natural construction is: *the body of this death*. The stress, then, lies on the word "death." The context forbids a reference to physical death and future glorification, which would be far-fetched. Death seems to mean: the whole condition of helplessness, guilt, and misery just described, which is, in effect, spiritual death. How, then, shall "body" be understood? Rejecting the allusion to the custom of chaining a living man to a corpse, but two views remain:

(*a.*) The literal sense, the body as the seat of this death; against this is the fact that this gives the word an ethical sense, which is unpauline. In its favor is the preceding phrase: "the law of sin in my members." If it be adopted, we must limit the meaning thus: "the body whose subjection to the law of sin brings about this state of misery" (Alford); but this is really a desire for death.

(*b.*) We prefer the figurative sense (with Calvin, Hodge, and others); "this death" has an organism, which is not only like a body in its organism, but in its close clinging to me; "from this death (thus represented) who shall deliver me?" The genitive is then possessive; the unity of the thought is preserved, and many difficulties avoided. This figurative sense of σῶμα is certainly more Pauline than the ethical one (comp. Excursus above, and vi. 6; viii. 10).—R.]

We here group the single elements of the idea of a pseudo-plasmatic human image, which sin has set up as a power that has become inherent in human nature:

1. The old man, who is not a real man; chap. vi. 6, and elsewhere.

2. The νοῦς τῆς σαρκός, which is not a real νοῦς; Col. ii. 18.

3. The φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός, which is not a real φρόνημα; chap. viii. 6.

4. The σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, which is not a real σῶμα; chap. vi. 6.

5. The σῶμα τοῦ θανάτου, which is not a real σῶμα; the present passage.

6. The νόμος ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι, which is not a real νόμος; chap. vii. 23.

7. The μέλη, which are not real μέλη; Col. iii. 5.

8. The σάρξ, which is something else than the external σάρξ; Rom. viii. 8.

9. The θάνατος, which is something else than physical death; Rom. viii. 6.*

Tholuck: On the exclamation of ver. 24: "The exclamation does not appear to us explicable merely from transition to earlier occurrences, but only because the continuously felt reaction of the old man has, so to speak, set off the preceding description." [Alford thinks, with De Wette, that the cry is uttered "in full consciousness of the deliverance which Christ has effected, and as leading to the expression of thanks which follows." A turning-point is reached, whatever be the reference, and no view is correct which does not admit that Paul here expresses what he *feels*, as well as what he *has* felt. —R.]

Ver. 25. **Thanks to God** [χάρις τῷ θεῷ, or, **I thank God,** εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ. See *Textual Note* [11]]. This reading corresponds to the previous exclamation much better than εὐχαριστῶ does. Those who continue the reference to the unregenerate to the conclusion, get into difficulty with this second exclamation. Hence the adoption of a parenthesis (Rückert, Fritzsche), or of a conditional construction (Erasmus, Semler). If that had not taken place, I would have been snatched asunder, with the spirit to serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin. Meyer observes: "*For what* he thanks God, is not mentioned." But the *for what* is plainly enough indicated by the context, as Meyer himself subsequently brings out. It is also indicated by his thanking God **through Jesus Christ.**

So then I myself with the mind [ἄρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοΐ]. In the consideration of this difficult passage there are two questions: 1. Is what is here said connected with the previous thanksgiving, or with ver. 24? 2. What, accordingly, is the meaning of αὐτὸς ἐγώ?

1. Some think that the thanksgiving does not come at all into consideration; the words are connected with ver. 24 (Rückert, Fritzsche). This makes the passage only a final opinion on the miserable condition under the law, a declaration of the consummated dissension in which man is situated under the law. Others (De Wette, Meyer, and others), on the contrary, very properly take the thanksgiving also into consideration, although both De Wette and Meyer find in the passage only a recapitulation of what has been said from vers. 14–24, which, according to Meyer, should follow from the immediately preceding εὐχαριστῶ. But the Apostle's language does not declare the *dissension* previously described, but the *alternative* now finally established. By accepting the probable breviloquence, and supplying the words which are at hand, we are relieved even here of the apparent obscurity. We read τῷ μὲν νοΐ (δουλεύων) δουλεύω; the Apostle has even omitted the δουλεύω from the τῇ δὲ σαρκί—a proof that both can be mentally supplied. Thus: *If I serve in the* νοῦς, *then I serve in the law of God; but if I serve* (or, *I would serve*) *in the flesh, then I serve the law of sin. Either, or!* This is favored, first of all, by the αὐτὸς ἐγώ. A recapitulation of the foregoing cannot be united with this view. For in ver. 20 we read: νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, &c. (comp. ver. 20). The following is the inference from the previous verses: that now there is a definite distinction between standing in the νοῦς (that is, in the principle of the νοῦς) and standing in the flesh (that is, in the principle of the flesh); but that, through Christ, he has gained the power to stand in the principle of the νοῦς. From this there arises the following thesis: I, *the same man*, can have a double standpoint. If I live with the νοῦς, I serve the law of God in truth; but if I live in the flesh, even in the form of the service of the law, I serve the (false) law of sin. In other words, the life in the νοῦς is the life in Christ, the life in the Spirit, and, like love, the fulfilment of the law (see chap. xiii. 8). It follows, therefore, on the one hand, that there is nothing condemnatory in the man of this standpoint. But there also follows the conclusion that they must live decidedly in harmony with their principle. But if they live purely in the νοῦς, the body, as a principle, must be dead—that is, rendered merely indifferent as a principle, and have nothing to say, on account of the sinfulness inherent in it (see chap. viii. 10). But this applies only to the present body, which is burdened with the propensity to sin. It is not to be trusted; it is devoid of pure harmony with the law of the Spirit, and therefore the Christian must keep it, as a bond-servant, under discipline and oversight. But this order is also temporary, so far as mortal bodies shall again be made alive by the Spirit of the risen Christ. As now the resurrection itself belongs to the *future* and the *one period*, so also does the completion of the purity of the body, its removal to the glorious liberty of the children of God, belong to the same future. But as the germ of the resurrection-body has already been made alive and increased in the believer in this life, so is it also the case with religious and moral purity in his body. In every conflict of the body with the law of the Spirit this alone should be decided; yet not carnally, in legal *mortifications*, but spiritually, in a dynamical *reckoning of ourselves to be dead* (see chap. vi. 1 ff.). That is, in a powerful departure beyond the πράξεις of the body with the works of the Spirit (see chap. viii. 13).

2. Different explanations of the αὐτὸς ἐγώ. (1.) *I myself*, Paul. The Apostle's description of himself as an example for others (Cassian, Pareus, Umbreit); (2.) *Ego idem.* The dissension in one and the same man made prominent (Erasmus, Calvin, and others); (3.) *Ille ego.* Reference to what he had earlier said of himself (Fritzsche, De Wette); (4.) *I alone;* that is, so far as I am without the mediation of Christ (Meyer, Baur, Hofmann); (5.) What he had heretofore described as the experience of mankind, he now describes as his own (Köllner).*

Olshausen's explanation is the nearest approach

* [Many will feel that Dr. Lange here gives an explanation which is not a real explanation. Sin, and flesh, and the old man, are real enough; but if he means that over against them is something, which is the ideal man, to be made real through the grace of Christ, then his remarks are significant. That the true explanation of this passage is to be sought in a discovery of modern science, anticipated by Paul, is improbable. Comp. *Doctr. Note* 13.—R.]

* [The explanation of Jowett is altogether untenable: "*I in my true self* serve the law of God; the remainder of the sentence may be regarded as an afterthought." The presence of μέν totally overthrows this. Jowett accepts it in his text, too, without even taking advantage of its omission in ℵ. F., to give a seeming propriety to his interpretation!—R.]

to correctness: "He thanks the Author of the work of redemption, God the Father, through Christ, whom he can now call *his Lord* from the heart. With this experience there now appears a totally changed condition in the inward life of the man, whose nature the Apostle describes in what follows, until its perfect completion, even the completion of the mortal body" (chap. viii. 11). He further holds, that the Divine law was reflected in the νοῦς; and in the inward man there arose the *wish*, yea, even the joy, to be able to observe it; but the principal thing was wanting—the κατεργάζεσθαι. "But by experiencing the redeeming power of Christ, by which the νοῦς is strengthened, man finds himself able, at least by the highest and noblest power of his nature, to serve the Divine law." Yet the σάρξ still remains subject to the law of sin. Therefore the conflict in the regenerate still continues, but yet it is generally victorious in the strength of Christ. Here Olshausen is led, to a certain extent, away from the Apostle's train of thought. As the Christian should die on the supposition of his being dead with Christ, so should he live on the supposition of his resurrection with Christ, and therefore he should fight on the supposition of victory (see 1 John v. 4). "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." If the watchword for the sanctification of the Christian gains its point, *to fight for victory*, it is nevertheless in conformity with the gospel standpoint that this takes place on the supposition of *fighting from victory*, or in conformity with the principle, εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ. But Olshausen, not without reason, regards ver. 25 as the beginning of the section commencing with the first of chap. viii.; it constitutes, at least, the transition to it.

Serve the law of God [δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ]. It is when man has become free from the law in its external form, that he truly serves the law of God in its real import (see chap. iii. 31; xiii. 8). (Reiche: the νοῦς is the *ideal* Jew; the flesh, as it were, is the *empirical* Jew.) Yet we may remark, that the αὐτὸς ἐγώ expresses the fact, that the time for decision is now come. A vacillation between the better and the false ἐγώ could take place under the law; but, after acquaintance with Christ, the real and complete ἐγώ will live either in the νοῦς, or in the flesh; will either serve God, or sin. But external legality, *placed over against Christ*, is now also a life in the flesh (see chap. vi. 14; Gal. v. 3 ff.; Col. ii. 18).

[*Note on the final sentence of ver.* 25. The interpretation is beset with difficulties.

1. Taking ἄρα οὖν as summing up the whole preceding section, and referring it to the regenerate, the service with the mind is of course the result of the new spiritual life, and, with the flesh, the result of indwelling sin. But why such a statement as this between the thanksgiving and the triumphant utterances of chap. viii.? It looks like taking this discord as the normal condition of the Christian life. If *I myself* be taken, with Meyer, and others, as opposed to "in Christ Jesus," then Forbes' explanation is satisfactory: "I in myself, notwithstanding whatever progress in righteousness the Spirit of Christ may have wrought in me, or will work in this life, am still most imperfect; with my mind indeed I serve the law of God, but with my flesh the law of sin; and, tried by the law, could not be justified, but would come under condemnation, if viewed *in myself*, and not *in Christ Jesus*." But this view of *I myself* is somewhat forced, as De Wette, who formerly adopted it, confesses. On doctrinal grounds, this interpretation is open to the same objections as those which refer the section to the unregenerate.

2. We may, with Lange, accept a future reference, in consequence of the turning-point being reached in the thanksgiving. But this requires us to supply a great deal, and to force the alternative meaning on μέν, δέ. It also confuses; for νοῦς and σάρξ, already used in contrast, on this view present a new distinction; and yet that new distinction is immediately afterwards repeatedly set forth by the terms, *spirit, flesh*. The only escape from this confusion is the assumption that, all along, the νοῦς was really in the interest of spiritual life, and now, being delivered, it acts out its impulses. This, for obvious reasons, we reject.

3. We may take *So then*, as summing up the preceding (as is done by the Augustinian expositors), *I myself* as the *same man*—*i. e.*, I, the man there described, under the law, with my mind, &c. It is not necessary to suppose a parenthesis; but, having depicted the experience up to, and inclusive of, the deliverance, he gathers up in meaning words the whole conflict, to contrast with it the normal state of the Christian; chap. viii. To this it will, of course, be objected, that "with my mind I serve the law of God" is too strong an expression to be referred to the man of the law; but it is precisely this service to the law that is the aim of the awakened conscience, the better desire, and it is precisely this he finds he cannot do, because the flesh is the ruling power by which he is brought into captivity, *in every case* where the mere service of law, even of the law of God, is all that is sought for. Should he seem to reach this aim, and be "touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless" (Phil. iii. 6), yet the service of the *mind* is not, by any means, the service of the Spirit. And, moreover, we must expect to find here, even after the thanksgiving, a quasi-confession of defeat as the point of connection with, "There is now, therefore, no condemnation," &c. Were the reference previously solely to the Christian, this would seem unnecessary. There are difficulties attending this view, it must be granted, but they are not so numerous as those I find in the others. The whole passage seems, by its alternations, its choice of words, as well as its position in the Epistle, to point to an experience which is produced by the holy, just, and good law of God, rather than the gospel of Jesus Christ; so that even the outburst of Christian gratitude is followed by a final recurrence to the conflict, which is, indeed, ever-recurring, so long as we seek holiness through the law rather than through Christ. See *Doctr. Note* [1].—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. See the above *Summary*; also the *Preliminary Remarks*.

[Paul here enters into a very remarkable psychological analysis of the working of the law, in order to show that it, although holy and good in itself, cannot effect the sanctification of man, on account of the power of indwelling sin, which can be overcome only through redeeming grace. He gives a chapter out of his own experience, especially out of the transition period from the law to the gospel. In this experience, however, is reflected, to a certain

extent, the history of the religious development of humanity as a whole. What is here so vividly individualized, repeats itself also in the experience of every earnest Christian. The law, instead of slaying sin, first brings it to a full manifestation (vers. 7-13); in the internal contest it is proven powerless; it but leads to the painful confession of helplessness (vers. 14-24); no other hope remains, save the grace of Jesus Christ (ver. 25).

Those expositors who follow the later Augustinian view, refer vers. 14-25 to the *regenerate*, because they are unwilling to ascribe to the natural man even this powerless longing after higher and better things.* On the other hand, those who refer them to the *unregenerate*, urge this reason, that the regenerate man is not so powerless, so captive to sin, as the person here described, but has overcome the dominion of sin, as the Apostle clearly indicates both in chaps. vi. and vii. The correct interpretation lies between these two. Paul describes his state, not when sunk in sin, but when awakened to earnest struggles against sin under the scourge of the law, under preparation for a state of grace—*i. e.*, in the period of transition from the law to the gospel, in the *Judaico-legalistic* state of *awakening*.

Thus much, however, must be conceded to the Augustinian view, that this contest is repeated in modified form in the regenerate. So long as they are in the flesh, the old life of Adam rules beside the new life in Christ. Temptations from the world, assaults of Satan, disturb; not unfrequently sin overcomes, and the believer, feeling deeply and painfully his own helplessness, turns in penitence to Christ's grace, to be the victor at last. It must be remembered, too, that there are many legal, despondent, melancholy Christians, who never pass out of the contest here described into the triumph of grace, the full freedom, the peace with God and assurance of salvation. The temperament and physical condition have a great influence in many such cases, but the main reason is, that such Christians depend too much upon themselves, and do not look sufficiently to the cross of Christ.—P. S.]

2. According to the above, the passage treats throughout neither of the unregenerate nor the regenerate, nor partially of the former and of the latter; but it describes the process, the living transition, of a man from the unregenerate to the regenerate state, who inwardly, and therefore properly, understands the law, and regards the commandment, *Thou shalt not covet*, as the root of all commandments. The question is not concerning a permanent condition, but a movement and a crisis; therefore first in the preterite, then in the present tense. The coöperation of the promise as well as the hope in this process of death which leads to life, is indeed assumed, but not described with it, because, to the combatant of the law, every thing, even the promise, the gospel-element itself, is transformed first of all into law; while, reversely, the finally triumphant faith, and then even the law (according to Origen), are transformed into pure gospel.

3. We must not overlook the fact that the Apostle here describes a gradation, whose stages are brought out prominently in the explanations—a gradation which apparently leads backward to despair and the sense of death, but, at the same time, truly upward to the true life. It is the way of godly sorrow to salvation; according to Luther, the descent of self-knowledge into hell, which is the preliminary condition to ascension to heaven with Christ. "Alas, what am I, my Redeemer? I find my state of soul daily worse." The full appearance of the leprosy on the surface of the body is the symptom of its healing.

["Paul means to show how utterly unavailing are all efforts to get rid of sin by mere nature, however much intensified by views of law and the actings of conscience, until the power of sin is broken by faith in the Source of spiritual life. No convictions of the excellence of the law, no acknowledgment of its purity and rightful obligation, no assent or consent to it as *good*, no approbation of it in the *real ego*, no preference for it nor temporary delight in it as commending itself to the judgment, and no strivings after obedience to its precept nor fear of its penalty admitted to be just, will avail against the law of sin and death, till it is superseded by another law of spiritual life derived from Christ by faith."—R.]

4. The law effects not only the knowledge, but also the *revelation* of sin—its full *development and manifestation*, but not its *genesis*. It accelerates its process to judgment, in order to make the sinner susceptible of, and fully in need of, deliverance. Thus it corresponds with the trials and appointments of God's government, which also impel man more and more to the development of his inward standpoint. The only difference is, that the law, as a spiritual effect, impels to the *ideal saving judgment* ("for if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged"), while the guidance of man by trials and temptations results principally in *real condemnatory judgments*. But here, too, God's law and ordination agree. To the elect, the ray of the law becomes a flash of lightning which prostrates them before the throne of grace; to harder natures, the flash of lightning which destroys their earthly glory must first become, in many forms, an illuminating beam. It is a fundamental thought of the Apostle, that the ἁμαρτία, which has unmasked itself in the *nature* of man, is compelled by the law to reveal itself in human life as παράβασις—as deadly *unnaturalness*. Thus the law drives the serpent from its concealment.

5. On the different definitions of the idea of the unregenerate and the regenerate, see Tholuck, p. 344. From Rom. viii. it is plain that the υἱοθεσία is the result of the original new birth, which is thus decided by justification. This new birth must be distinguished prospectively from the broader and final new birth in the resurrection (Matt. xix. 28), and retrospectively from the spiritual production of man by the word of God as the seed of the new birth, which begins with the strong and penetrating call of man by law and gospel (1 Peter i. 23). It must be distinguished laterally from its sacramental symbolization and sealing, which is, at the same time, its normal foundation, as the ideal and social new birth, as in the apostolical sphere it *coincided* identically with it, and it *accords* with it in normal ecclesiastical relations, but, amid ecclesiastical corruptions, can also *go to ruin* with it.

6. A description of three stages of the *vita sanctorum*, in Bucer, see Tholuck, p. 337. See also the views on the practical effects of the twofold exposition of this passage, as applying to the regenerate and the unregenerate, in the note, p. 338. Also, a further treatment of this question, Tholuck, p. 341 ff

* [Hence the Arminian controversy really began upon the exegesis of this passage. It cannot be doubted that this controversy has led to extreme views in both directions respecting the meaning of this chapter.—R.]

[Dr. Hodge rightly reprobates the saying of Dr. A. Clarke (quoted approvingly by Tholuck in the note referred to by Lange): "This opinion has most pitifully and shamefully not only lowered the standard of Christianity, but destroyed its influence and disgraced its character." The danger from an exclusive reference to the unregenerate, is discouragement to weak believers; but that from the other reference is not false security in sin, so much as a tendency to keep the Christian under the scourge of the law. It does encourage a morbid, unrelieved state of conscience, and legal efforts after sanctification. (Comp. the latter part of *Doctr. Note* [1].) To refer it to a movement possible both before and after conversion, a state with reference to the law, *encourages* unbelievers to go to Christ, and *rouses* believers to go to Him, since the existence of the conflict shows that the schoolmaster is nearer than the delivering Master. Here Delitzsch is excellent: "Every Christian is compelled to confirm what the Apostle here says, from his own personal experience. And well for him if he can also confirm the fact that God's law, and therefore God's will, is his delight—that he desires the good, and hates the evil; and, indeed, in such a way that the sin to which, against his will, he is hurried away, is foreign to his inmost nature. But woe to him, if, from his own personal experience, he could confirm only this, and not also the fact that the spirit of the new life, having its source in Christ Jesus, has freed him from the urgency of sin and the condition of death, which were not abrogated through the law, but only brought to light; so that his will, which, although powerless, was by the law inclined toward what is good, is now actually capable of good, and opposed to the death still working in him, as a predominating, overmastering power of life, to be finally triumphant in glory."—R.]

7. The prohibition, "Thou shalt not covet" (ver. 7), is known to be of very great weight in dividing the Ten Commandments. If it be divided into two commandments, the objects of the lust (coveting) are the principal thing. But the Apostle views it as a prohibition of wicked lust itself, and thereby it becomes a complete commandment, which extends, in sense, even through all the commandments. (Comp. Tholuck, p 350.) On the shallow constructions of the doctrine of the sinfulness of wicked lust, by the Rabbins, see the same, p. 351. In a similar way, a regard for a life of feeling recedes to an ever-increasing distance in the dogmatics of the Middle Ages, in consequence of the stress laid on the merit of good works.

8. On ver. 8. Different variations of the *nitimur in vetitum* among the classical writers (see Tholuck, p. 353, note; Prov. ix. 17). The law produces reflection on the forbidden object, curiosity, doubt, distrust of the lawgiver, imaginations, lusts, susceptibility of the seed of temptation, and of seduction, and, finally, the production of rebellion—the παράβασις. The history of childhood, of Israel, and the Antinomianism of the early Christian period (Nitzsch, *Die Gesammterscheinung des Antinomismus*); the history of Antinomianism in the time of the Reformation (the Münster Anabaptists, the Genevan Libertines, &c.); and the whole history of Divine and human legislation furnishes proof of the Apostle's proposition (Balaamites, Nicolaitans). Nevertheless, the law is holy, just, and good (see the *Exeg. Notes*); its design and operation are saving. Because Christ was the law of God personified, He has experienced in Himself the full Divine revelation of the opposition of sinful humanity to the law; He was proscribed as if He had been sin personified. But with this complete revelation of the power of sin, grace attained its still more powerful revelation.

9. On the reference of ver. 9 to the age of childhood, see Tholuck, p. 356, and the above *Exeg. Notes*.

10. On ver. 13. On the different meanings of the commandment, "This do, and thou shalt live," see the *Exeg. Notes*. *This do, and thou shalt live* means: 1. Living in the outward blessing of external obedience; 2. *Dying in order to live*; 3. First really living after this death.

11. The law is holy in its principle (the will of God); just in its method (establishing and administering justice); good in its design (promoting life itself by the ideal death in self-knowledge). The sinner had to be delivered from death by death—objectively by the death of Christ, subjectively by the reception of the death of Christ in his own life—by his spiritual dying. Calovius: *Sancta dicitur lex ratione causæ efficientis et materialis: quia a deo sanctissimo est et circa objecta sancta occupatur; justa est formaliter: quia justitiæ divinæ ἀπεικόνισμα, nostræ regula est; bona est ratione finis, quia bona temporalia et æterna promittit.* The last definition is the weakest. Of *justa*, Tholuck uses these words: "more correctly, since it produces 'righteousness.'"

12. On the manner in which sin misconstrues the law, in order to make it minister to its own ends, and also on the gradual development of self-knowledge, see the *Exeg. Notes*.

13. Unless we have a definite idea of the false forms in organic life, we cannot gain the Apostle's complete view, which we have sketched in the *Exeg. Notes*. Either the individual figures in question are volatilized into hyperbolical metaphors, or people have fallen into dualistic and Manichæan notions, which have been made to underlie the Apostle's thoughts, now in order to appeal to him, now to govern him. See "Sydenham," by Jahn, Eisenach, 1840, p. 56: As diseases in the vegetable world are known to show themselves in inferior and parasitical organisms (fungi, mosses, mistletoes, &c.), so does disease in man show a lower, half-independent vital process and inferior organism, secreted like a germ and parasite in the original life. Similar expressions by Paracelsus, on the inferior organisms undermining the healthy life.—Comp. Schuh's *Pathologie und Therapie der Pseudoplasmen*, Vienna, 1854.—False organic forms pervert the functions and material substance of natural life into noxious shapes and poisons. The false spiritual form—sin—perverts the true life of man into a luxuriant growth of false spiritual images of this life.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Acquaintance with sin is effected by the law, so far, 1. as the law, as a prohibition, provokes sin; 2. but also that the consciousness of sin be complete (vers. 7–12).—What does sin take from and give to man? 1. It takes life from him; 2. It gives him death (vers. 7–12).—The abuse of what is holy, 1. is indeed horrible, but yet, 2. what is holy is not itself destructive (vers. 7–12).—The destruction of the state of innocence: 1 Apparently produced by

the Divine prohibition; 2. Actually produced by human sin (vers. 7-12).—How the best teacher can become a tempter against his will, when he, 1. exempts from a well-meant prohibition; 2. but when this very prohibition awakens the desire for transgression (vers. 7-12).—We should not prohibit children from too much.—The best thing we have is corrupted by sin (ver. 10).—The fearful deception of sin (ver. 11).—The holiness of the Divine law. It is shown to us when we, 1. look at the lawgiver; 2. carefully prove the principal statements of the commandments; 3. have in mind the design for which it was given (ver. 12).—Whence does it come that what is good is made death unto me? 1. The fault does not lie in the law, which is spiritual; but, 2. in me, who am carnal (properly, "flesh-like"), sold under sin (vers. 13, 14).—Proof of how sin, aiming at the ruin of man, prepares its own overthrow (ver. 13).—What is, "to be sold under sin?" 1. Not to know what we do—blindness of self-knowledge; 2. Not to do what we will, but to do what we hate—perversion of our own spontaneity (vers. 14, 15).—Even in his sin, man must testify to the goodness of the law (ver. 16).—In the flesh there dwelleth no good thing (ver. 16).—To will and to perform! 1. How near the willing of what is good is to us; 2. But how far from us is the performance of it (vers. 18, 19)!—The deep sorrow expressed in the confession, "for to will is present with me, but how to perform," &c.; because we then say as much as: 1. I wish the good very much; but, 2. I am just as much devoid of the power to do it (ver. 18).—The surprising discovery of man on the way to his conversion (ver. 21).—The double law in man: 1. The true law in the mind; 2. The false law in the members (vers. 22-25).—The divided state of the human heart: 1. Caused by sin (vers. 18-20); 2. Manifesting itself in the conflict of the two laws (vers. 22, 23, 25); 3. Calling forth the longing for deliverance (ver. 24).—The thanksgiving of the Apostle for the peace of deliverance (ver. 25; comp. chap. i. 25).

LUTHER: *To do* does not mean here to perform the work, but to feel the excitement of the lusts. But to perform, is to live without lust, totally pure; this does not take place in this life (vers. 18, 19).—He here calls death the misery and pains endured in the conflict with sin (as Exod. x. 17). Pharaoh says: "That he may take away from me this death only" (this was the locusts).

STARKE: The natural man is like the earth since the curse has been pronounced upon it. The earth has the seeds of all kinds of weeds in it; and although they seem, in Winter, to lie perfectly dead in the earth, yet, by the warm rain in the Spring, they will again germinate and grow (ver. 8).—Sin is a real highway robber; it associates in a friendly way with us, and strives to lead us off from the right road, but afterwards kills us (ver. 11).—When sin has become suddenly powerful, do not despond; God does not wish the death of the sinner. Flee in penitence to Christ, and you shall be holy (ver. 13).—Believers do many good works, but not all that they should; and what they do, is far from being as perfect as it should be (ver. 18).—Believing Christians lament more over the weaknesses still cleaving to them, than over temporal torments, chains, and bonds (ver. 20).

OSIANDER: The law is a beautiful mirror, which shows us our sins, in order that, when we perceive such great evil, we may get counsel and help from Christ (ver. 7).—If believers sin, and it occurs against their will, they do not lose the favor of God (ver. 17).—CRAMER: Innate wicked lust a fountain of all sins, and it is also against God's law; we should not allow ourselves to lust at all (ver. 7).—There are two characteristics of true Christians, so long as they are in the world: they give themselves trouble about their wretchedness, but they rejoice and take comfort because of the deliverance (redemption) that has taken place through Jesus Christ (ver. 25).—*Nova Bibl. Tüb.*: There is nothing so good that it cannot become evil by abuse. In this way the blessed gospel becomes to many a savor of death unto death (ver. 10).—SPENER: Our nature is so sinful that we do not take as much pleasure in any thing as in what is forbidden (ver. 8).—It is a most eminent attainment, and one necessary for a right understanding of the law and sin, that we properly understand the spiritual character of the law (ver. 14).—Those can profit by this Pauline example (ver. 25) who strive with all earnestness to do what is good; but those who do not strive with all earnestness to do what is good, but still sin frequently with the will, cannot employ the language of Paul, for they are not in harmony with his example.—In short, if one will have a pattern, let him take this: No one must lay claim to any comfort in this chapter whose counterpart is found in chaps. vi. or viii.; but these three chapters must harmonize.

BENGEL: We have here a figure from military life: The soul is the king, the members are the subjects, and sin is the enemy whom the king has admitted. The king is now punished by the insurrection of his subjects, who rise in rebellion with the enemy.—GERLACH: The law is *spiritual*, means: it is an emanation from God, who is a Spirit (John iv. 24); that is, omnipotent, personal, and holy love. It is, further, spiritual in its import—that is, divine and holy. It pertains to the inmost being of man, which it would fully conform to God.—There stands in opposition to it the *carnal* sense of man; that is, his desire, which is directed, by virtue of sin, to the world, finiteness, and sensuousness, and makes him who is sundered from his Creator a servant of the creature (ver. 14).—An Apostle glowing with love, like Paul, humbles himself, and trembles and groans under the law of sin; and shall we, who are like ice in comparison with him, foolishly expose ourselves, and boast of whatever can awaken lust in us? (ver. 14.)—The incapacity of man to do good, is an incapacity of the *will*; this, and not an incapacity of spiritual *disposition*, has necessitated it; it is therefore a weakness, which is continually attended by the sense of guilt (ver. 18).—The exclamation of the Apostle is the cry for help of all humanity, which, in despair of all help through and of itself, looks for aid from without. The law leads to this desire, but it cannot deliver from the wretchedness (ver. 24).—He who sighs most deeply over the bondage in the body of this death, stands nearest to deliverance (ver. 24).

LISCO: What Paul here makes clear in itself, is a truth of universal human experience—namely, that there are *two* successive states (the third is described in chap. viii.): one (ver. 9), where sin slumbers in us, because we are not fully conscious of the moral law; the other (vers. 14-24), where, having a clear knowledge of the law, but yet without the grace of redemption, we become acquainted with the profound corruption of our heart, which is opposed to the law of God, and feel wretched in this condition

—The conflict described in vers. 14–25 occurs, before the new birth, in the heart of a man awakened by the law; yet, in the life of the regenerate person, similar conflicts and phenomena arise, in which, however, he is ever triumphant.—The Apostle was far from holding the erroneous view, that sin dwells only in man's body, and not also in his soul (ver. 24).—I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord! Through Him, He has delivered me *in* and *from* all this wretchedness (ver. 25).—HEUBNER: The best thing can be made an injury to the wicked will (ver. 12).—Every thing becomes impure in the impure heart. *Corruptio optimi est generatio pessimi* (ver. 13).—Description of the evil propensity (vers. 14–25).—It is the best people who confess, that strong sensuous impulses in them are sinful (ver. 14).—The inward contradiction of man with himself. The conflict between knowing, willing, and doing (ver. 15).—Even the immoral man feels that it would have been better if he had kept the law (ver. 16).

BESSER: The twofold way in which sin becomes exceeding sinful by the commandment: 1. Its wicked, ungodly nature, plays a prominent part in the transgression of the plain commandment; 2. The sentence of death which transgression effects, drives sin into the conscience of man, so that he feels and perceives it to be a horror and abomination before God (ver. 13).—The conflict between spirit and flesh in believers (vers. 14–25).—"Believers know and feel," says Luther (*Works*, viii., 2747), "that no good thing dwells in their flesh, so that they may become more humble, and let their peacock-tail fall; that is, do not depend on their own righteousness and good works," &c. (ver. 18).

LANGE: The way of the law from sin to grace: 1. Apparently, ever darker and deeper toward death; 2. Really, always nearer to light and life.—The sad revelation of sin a preliminary condition of the joy—bringing revelation of salvation.—The development of self-knowledge under the law: 1. Clear view which reason has of the authority of the law; 2. Earnest wrestling of the will; 3. Outburst of deeply-affected feeling (oh, wretched man that I am).—How the proverb, "Man's extremity is God's opportunity," is most gloriously verified in the conversion of man.—The struggle between sin and the law: 1. The deception which sin practises with the law; 2. The unmasking effected by the law through the apparent charm of sin.—How the law becomes always more inward to the candid person, until he has perceived it as his spiritual I, his consciousness, his reason.—The fearful, false power of evil: 1. It assumes all the features of personal life; 2. In order to exhaust and destroy personal life in all its features.—The cry for deliverance occurs in close proximity with thanksgiving and praise to God.—On ver. 25: *Either, or!*

[JEREMY TAYLOR (condensed from sermon on the *Christian's Conquest over the Body of Sin*, Rom. vii. 19): The evil natures, principles, and manners of the world are the causes of our imperfect willings and weaker actings in the things of God. Let no man please himself with perpetual pious conversation or ineffective desires of serving God; he that does not practise, as well as talk, and do what he desires and ought to do, confesses himself to sin greatly against his conscience; and it is a prodigious folly to think that he is a good man, because, though he does sin, it was yet against his mind to do so. Every good man can watch always; running from temptation is a part of our watchfulness; every good employment is a second and great part of it and laying in provisions of reason and religion beforehand is a third part of it; and the conversation of Christians is a fourth part of it.—MATT. HENRY, on vers. 24, 25: When, under the sense of the remaining power of sin and corruption, we shall see reason to bless God *through* Christ and *for* Christ. Through Christ's death, an end will be put to all our complaints, and we shall be wafted to an eternity without sin or sigh.—It is a special remedy against fears and sorrows, to be much in praise.—SCOTT: A proper knowledge of the holy law of God is the two-edged sword which gives the death-wound to self-righteousness and to Antinomianism; for it is perfectly fit to be the rule of our duty, written in our hearts, and obeyed in our lives.—CLARKE: We never find that true repentance takes place where the moral law is not preached and enforced. The law is the grand instrument, in the hands of a faithful minister, to alarm and awaken sinners; and he may safely show that every sinner is under the law, and consequently under the curse, who has not fled for refuge to the hope held out by the gospel.—HODGE: It is an evidence of an unrenewed heart to express or feel opposition to the law of God, as though it were too strict; or to be disposed to throw the blame of our want of conformity to the Divine will from ourselves upon the law, as unreasonable.—The Christian's victory over sin cannot be achieved by the strength of his resolutions, nor by the plainness and force of moral motives, nor by any resources within himself. He looks to Jesus Christ, and conquers in His strength. The victory is not obtained by nature, but by grace.—BARNES: We have here: 1. A view of the sad and painful conflict between sin and God. They are opposed in all things; 2. We see the raging, withering effect of sin on the soul. In all circumstances it tends to death and wo; 3. We see the feebleness of the law and of conscience to overcome this. The tendency of both is to produce conflict and wo; 4. We see that the gospel only can overcome sin. To us it should be a subject of ever-increasing thankfulness, that what could not be accomplished by the law, can be thus effected by the gospel; and that God has devised a plan that thus effects complete deliverance, and gives to the captive in sin an everlasting triumph.—J. F. H.]

Sixth Section.—*Christian life, or life in the Spirit of Christ as the new life according to the law of the Spirit, is a blessed life in the adoption of God; is free from condemnation and death; and leads to perfect blessedness in the glory of God. The principle of the new life as the principle of the freedom and glorification of the Christian, of believing humanity, and even of the creature;* chap. viii.

Divisions: I. Life in the Spirit a life of opposition to the flesh; and the Spirit as witness of adoption; vers. 1-17. *II. The renewal of the body by the life in the Spirit, and the Spirit as the security for glorification;* vers. 18-39.

I. Life in the Spirit in opposition to the flesh, and the Spirit as the witness of adoption.

Chapter VIII. 1-17.

1 *There is* therefore now no condemnation to them which [those who] are in
Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit [*omit all after* Christ
2 Jesus].[1] For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free
3 [freed me][2] from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in
that [because] it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the
likeness of sinful flesh [*literally*, the flesh of sin], and for [*or*, on account of] sin,
4 condemned sin in the flesh: That the righteousness [*or*, requirement][3] of the
law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after [according to][4] the flesh, but
after [according to] the Spirit.
5 For they that [those who] are after [according to] the flesh do mind the
things of the flesh; but they that [those who] are after [according to] the Spirit,
6 the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded [the mind of the flesh][5] *is*
death; but to be spiritually minded [the mind of the Spirit] *is* life and peace.
7 Because the carnal mind [the mind of the flesh] *is* enmity against God: for it
is not subject [doth not submit itself][6] to the law of God, neither indeed can
8 be [it]. So then [And][7] they that [those who] are in the flesh cannot please
God.
9 But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God
dwell in you. Now if any man have [hath][8] not the Spirit of Christ, he is
10 none of his. And [But] if Christ *be* [*is*] in you, the body *is* dead because of
11 sin; but the Spirit [spirit] *is* life because of righteousness. But [And] if the
Spirit of him that raised up Jesus[9] from the dead dwell [dwelleth] in you, he
that raised up Christ from the dead shall [will][10] also quicken [quicken even]
your mortal bodies by [on account of][11] his Spirit that dwelleth in you.
12 Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh.
13 For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through [by][12] the Spirit
14 do mortify the deeds of the body,[13] ye shall live. For as many as are led by
15 the Spirit of God, they are the [*omit* the][14] sons of God. For ye have not
received [did not receive][15] the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have
[*omit* have] received the Spirit of adoption, whereby [ἐν ᾧ, wherein] we cry,
16 Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with [*or*, to][16] our spirit, that
17 we are the [*omit* the] children of God: And if children, then [also] heirs; heirs
of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with *him*, that we
may be also glorified together [glorified with *him*].[17]

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 1.—[The clause, added in *Rec.*: μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα, is now rejected by the best critics as a gloss from ver. 4. It is not found in ℵ. B. C. D.[1] F., most older versions and fathers. The first half only is added in A. D.[3], some versions. ℵ.[3] adds the whole. The MS. authority is sufficiently against it to warrant a decided rejection. Forbes: "The results of Parallelism coincide with the decisions of criticism, and with the authority of the best MSS., in rejecting the words."

1. Οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα
 τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.
2. Ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς
 ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠλευθέρωσέν με
 ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου.
3. Τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου.
 ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός,
 ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας
 ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας
 κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί.

The first and tenth lines correspond; the parallelisms of second and fourth, third and fifth, sixth and eighth, seventh and ninth, are obvious, and the gain in interpretation is considerable. Fritzsche avails himself of it also.

[2] Ver. 2.—[The weighty MSS., ℵ. B. F. G., and some fathers, read σε; but this might readily be repeated from the preceding syllable, -σεν. A. C. D. K. L., most versions, give με, now generally adopted. There is slight authority for ἡμᾶς. *Freed me*, is literal, and to be preferred to *hath made me free, set me free.* It refers to a definite past act (aorist).

[3] Ver. 4.—[The E. V. uses *righteousness*, very indefinitely, to translate several words of kindred meaning. Here it is obviously incorrect, as δικαίωμα means, literally, a righteous decree, ordinance, statute, act (see pp. 74, 184); and in this case refers to the summing up of all the requirements of the law, as fulfilled by Christ. Lange: *Gerechtsein*, *requirement*, is not strictly exact, but is adopted by Alford, Amer. Bible Union. Version of five English clergymen: *righteous demand*. See *Exeg. Notes*.

[4] Ver. 4.—[*According to*, is the phrase which now best expresses the meaning of κατά, though *after* (German, *nach*) is literal. It is becoming unusual in this sense.

[5] Ver. 6.—[The E. V., with its usual fondness for hendiadys, has departed from a literal rendering in vers. 6 and 7, at the expense of both accuracy and force.

[6] Ver. 6.—[*Is not subject* (E. V.), is correct, but the above emendation brings out the middle force of ὑποτάσσεται.

[7] Ver. 8.—[*So then*, is a gloss, rather than a translation. It is a difficult matter to reproduce all the delicate shades of antithetical force expressed by the frequently recurring δέ. Some alterations in the verses immediately succeeding have been made with this in view.

[8] Ver. 9.—[*Have* is conditional, but *hath* is preferable, as intimating more decidedly that the state of things really exists. For the same reason, *dwelleth* is preferable to *dwell*, in ver. 11.

[9] Ver. 11.—[The better supported reading is Ἰησοῦν; the article is inserted in some MSS., as also before Χριστόν. There is also the usual number of variations, so common when these words occur in the text.

[10] Ver. 11.—[*Will*, to express the simple future in the third person. The E. V. seems to prefer *shall* in such cases, and, indeed, some still defend it. The usage of the present time is undoubtedly against it.

[11] Ver. 11.—[Here two readings present themselves, supported by authorities of equal weight. The genitive: διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος is found in *Rec.*, ℵ. A. C., many versions and fathers, as is adopted by Lachmann, De Wette, Krehl. The accusative: διὰ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα, is supported by B. D. E. F. K. L., many cursives and fathers, by Griesbach, Schols, Fritzsche, Mill, Bengel, Tischendorf (in later editions), Meyer (who cites Lachmann also in its favor), Tholuck, Rückert, Alford, Wordsworth, Tregelles, Lange. It will be seen that a majority of critical editors adopt the latter reading. The reasons which have determined this decision seem to be, that two such readings could not have existed without one being a premeditated corruption. The question then arises, Which reading would best serve a polemic purpose, and hence be most likely to have been the corrupted one? That question is answered by the controversy between the Macedonians and Orthodox (latter part of the fourth century) respecting the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. The Macedonians charged the Orthodox with an alteration of the text into the genitive. The genitive can only mean, *by means of His Spirit*, &c.; while the accusative may include that idea of agency in connection with the thought, *on account of His Spirit*, &c. It is plain that the Macedonians had less motive to alter the text than the Orthodox. Alford thinks the variation dates back of this controversy, and is not due to either of the then disputant parties; but the same reason would hold good at a previous point of theological discussion. Lange well remarks, that, in any case, "the raising act of God is distinguished in this verse from the working of the Spirit." Hodge sums up the internal evidence in favor of the common reading; but all his remarks only prove that the other is a more unusual reading, and hence likely to have been altered. It is better to follow the current of criticism, and adopt the accusative.

[12] Ver. 13.—[The simple dative πνεύματι is best rendered, *by the Spirit*. *Through* should be reserved as a translation of διά.

[13] Ver. 13.—[D. E. F. G., many fathers, have τοῦ σάρκος; but τοῦ σώματος is supported by ℵ. A. B. C. K. L., and nearly all modern editors. The former was probably a correction, arising out of a misunderstanding of the passage.

[14] Ver. 14.—[*Rec.*, K. L., have εἰσιν υἱοὶ θεοῦ; ℵ. A. C. D., υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν; B. F. G., υἱοὶ εἰσιν θεοῦ. The last reading is adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth, Tregelles. It is supported by the majority of the fathers, and the variations are more readily accounted for on the supposition that it is the original reading; εἰσιν, if once passed over, would be inserted at the beginning or end (Meyer).

[15] Ver. 15.—[The aorist ἐλάβετε refers to a definite past time; hence, *did not receive, received.*

[16] Ver. 16.—[See *Exeg. Notes*.

[17] Ver. 17.—[*With him*, is as proper here as in the preceding clause. See *Exeg. Notes*.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

First Section.—*The life in the Spirit* as the new life, in opposition to the life in the flesh* (vers. 1–17).

Summary.—*a.* The vital principle of Christians, or the law of the Spirit as freedom from the antagonistic law of sin (vers. 1–4). *b.* The principle of carnal life in contradiction to the Spirit and to God (vers. 5–8). *c.* Application of what has been said to the fundamental standpoint of believers (vers. 9–11). Their life in the Spirit excludes life in the carnal principle. Their Christianity amounts to nothing, if the Spirit is wanting. If Christ is in the spirit, the body is nothing. But the body shall be renewed at the resurrection by the Spirit. *d.* Transition from the ideal and fundamental standpoint to the practical application. The conflict resulting from the victory, and the maxims of this conflict (vers. 12–16). No obligation to the flesh.—Spiritual life the means of destroying the surprises of involuntary carnal motions.—Following the guidance of the Spirit.—No fear of the power of the flesh Childlike recourse to the Father.—The sense of adoption strengthened by the Spirit of God. Ver. 17: transition to the following section.*

Meyer: chap. viii. Happy condition of man in Christ.—De Wette: Blessed results of newly-animated morality. Tholuck: For thus the Christian, who has become freed from the law, has also become free from condemnation, and is subject to the guidance of the Spirit of adoption, by virtue of which he will become a joint-heir with Christ (vers. 1–17). The same: "We are here at the climax of the Epistle, 'at the heart and kernel of the whole Epistle;' as Spener says: *Si scripturam sacram annulo comparemus, epistolam Pauli ad Romanos gemmam credo, cujus summum fastigium in capite octavo exsurgit* (Spener, *Consilia Theol. Lat.*, iii. 596)." [Bengel: *Nunc venit ad liberationem et libertatem.*—R.]

Ver. 1. **There is therefore now no** [Οὐδὲν

* [It seems doubtful whether Dr. Lange means the Holy Spirit here; but as he certainly insists that the Holy Spirit is the agent producing this life, it is better to indicate it by printing this word with a capital letter.—R.]

* [Alford thus heads the section: "Although the flesh is still subject to the law of sin, the Christian, serving not the flesh, but walking according to the Spirit, shall not come into condemnation, but to glory with Christ." Hodge, making the theme of the Apostle "the security of believers," gives the first verse a wide reference, both present and future, and considers the whole chapter a series of proofs of this proposition.—R.]

ἄρα νῦν. The force of οὐδέν must not be overlooked—an absolute negation, with an undoubted reference to the *completeness* of the freedom from condemnation (Forbes).—R.] The ἄρα is quite plain, if we have perceived the alternative in the preceding verse: If I am in the νοῦς, I serve God. If we ignore this alternative, the meaning of the present passage must be doubtful. Tholuck: The older expositors do not generally furnish any proof of the connection of this ἄρα with the preceding chapter. Yet the following connection of it with chap. vii. 25, by Augustine, is, in the main, correct: "To him, now, who, as a Christian, *non amplius consentit pravis desideriis*, and is planted in Christ by baptism, the *prava desideria* can no more be condemnation." The Catholic expositors follow him. Bucer, Beza [Alford], and others, connect ver. 25 with the thanksgiving; but this assumes that the second half of ver. 25 is an interruption. Calixtus, Bengel [Stuart], and others, go back even to chap. vii. 6; others [Hodge, Haldane], to the whole argument for justification by faith. Meyer: If I am left to myself to serve the law of God with my reason, but the law of sin with my flesh, then it follows that, since Christ has interposed, there is no condemnation, &c.—[The question of connection is mainly decided by the view of the preceding section. Those who refer it to the regenerate, connect this either with the whole preceding argument, or, with Philippi, with the preceding verse, in the sense: Although I am thus divided in service, still, being in Christ Jesus, there is now, therefore, &c.; or with the thanksgiving. If Lange's view of the alternative be admitted, we must also accept his view of the connection. It seems to be an unwarranted breaking up of the current of thought, to go back as far as chap. vii. 6; and to refer to the whole train of argument, seems out of keeping with the continuous experimental character of the whole passage. It is best to connect, therefore, with the thanksgiving.—R.]—*Νῦν*, the intervening state of faith, expressed last in ver. 25. [*Νῦν* is *temporal*, in distinction from οὖν (ver. 25), which is *inferential*. Hence the continuance of this state is implied.—R.]

No condemnation [*κατάκριμα, Verdammungsurtheil, sentence of condemnation* (Lange). See p. 184 (v. 16), where it is used in antithesis to δικαίωμα. It may be limited to the justifying act of God at the beginning of the Christian life, but, joined with οὐδέν, seems to have a wider reference here.—R.] Origen, Erasmus, Luther, and others, explain: nothing worthy of condemnation; but this is opposed by the τοῖς. See also ver. 34. Comp. chap. v. 16. Koppe generalizes *nulla pœna* [Alford: no penal consequence of sin, original and actual], which so far at least belongs to the affair that even the temporal punishment, *as punishment*, and as prelude to the final condemnation, is abolished in the case of Christians. And this is so, not only because their sins are forgiven (Pareus), but because they are in Christ in consequence thereof.

[The question of the reference to justification or sanctification must affect the interpretation of *condemnation*, since ver. 2, beginning with γάρ, seems to introduce a proof. The position of the chapter in the Epistle, as well as a fair exegesis of the verses, sustain the reference to sanctification. (Not to the entire exclusion of the other, any more than they are sundered in Christian experience.) We must, then, take *no condemnation* in a wide sense, either as deliverance both from sin and death (Forbes), or as having indeed a reference to the justifying act already past, but meaning, rather, the continuance in a state of justification, culminating in final acquittal and glory. The point of connection with ver. 24 ("death"), is the former reference; with the succeeding proof, the latter. This avoids sundering salvation into two distinct parts. The significant phrase which follows favors this view. Still, the position of the verse warrants us in finding a very distinct reference to the act of pardon, as preceding (and involving as a gracious consequence) the work of sanctification.—R.]

[To those who are in Christ Jesus, τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ]. This does not mean precisely, to have the Spirit of Christ, or Christ in you (Meyer), but it denotes the permanent continuance in justification—a life whose effect is the life of Christ in us. [This deeply significant Pauline phrase must never be weakened or limited. As to its beginnings, Augustine is excellent: *Christus in homine, ubi fides in corde.* As to its continuance, Bucer: *A Christo pendere atque ejus spiritus in omnibus agi.* But the best explanation is John xv. 1–7, and Eph. i. 23, &c. Hodge says: in Him federally, vitally, by faith; but the vital union seems always prominent; especially is it so here.—R.]

On the addition, see *Textual Note*. [Besides what is there remarked, the question of connection suggests, that the interpolation may have been occasioned by a desire to relieve the apparent difficulty in making ver. 2 prove the justification of the believer. To do this, the clause which makes prominent the Christian walk, so easily borrowed from ver. 4, was inserted.—R.]

Ver. 2. **For the law of the Spirit of life,** &c. [ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ]. Ver. 2 specifies the ground* why Christians are free from condemnation. The principal question here is, whether ἐν Χριστῷ is to be referred to the following ἠλευθέρωσεν, or to the foregoing, and how far to the foregoing? Meyer, in accordance with Theodoret, Erasmus, Rückert (not "Tholuck"), Olshausen, Philippi, and De Wette, has also connected the ἐν Χριστῷ with ἠλευθ. But this distorts the thought, as if that Spirit of life could possibly deliver without Christ. Certainly ἐν Χριστῷ refers not alone to the foregoing ζωῆς (Luther, Beza, and others); and ζωή here is not the believer's subjective life in Christ, but Christ's original divine-human life itself. We must also not go back to τοῦ πνεύμ. τῆς ζωῆς alone (Flatt), but to the whole ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύμ. τ. ζ. (Calvin, Köllner, Tholuck).† The fulness of life in Christ is the Spirit (see John vi. 63); it is complete in itself, conscious, actual, and communicates itself as a unity with the Holy Spirit. It is just for this reason, also, the glorification of the νόμος, the personal righteousness; and as it has proved itself to be the completed νόμος, the ideal and dynamical principle of the Divine law in the obedience of Christ, so does it now prove itself to those who are in Christ; that is, justification becomes in them the principle of sanctification. But

* [Dr. John Brown renders γάρ, *moreover*, or would connect it with the thanksgiving in ver. 25. He refers this verse to sanctification, and ver. 1 to justification; hence would avoid making the former the ground of the latter.—R.]

† [The absence of the article is not decisive against this connection, though it favors more the connection with ζωῆς. Still, the parallelism strongly supports that view which joins it with the verb.—R.]

because this life-giving law takes the place of the Mosaic law—which could not deliver, but was completed by sin and death—there lies in the appropriation of this glorified law freedom from the law of sin and death.*

The law of the Spirit is not identical with the νόμος τοῦ νοός (Köllner, Schröder), but still the latter is connected with the former. The νόμος of the νοῦς is the ontological disposition which has attained its complete historical and concrete realization in the νόμος of the Spirit. Meyer observes, that the Christian institution of salvation is not meant, as νόμος πίστεως in chap. iii. 27. Yet it is surely identical, to a certain degree, with the νόμος πίστ., but not with the Christian institution of salvation.†

Of the Spirit. Meyer explains: of the Holy Spirit. And this is, indeed, substantially the fact; but the Holy Spirit is spoken of so far as He reveals himself concretely in the vital plenitude of Christ. Tholuck's exposition is in the same direction: "The Spirit of life is that by which the spiritual life is effected in believers." The law of the Spirit is the impulse and guidance of the Spirit, under the reciprocal action between the principle of faith and the administration of God's government in the occurrences of life.

Freed me [ἠλευθέρωσέν με. The verb is aorist, referring to a past act, viz., the deliverance both from sin and from death, which took place at regeneration. Not completed, but begun when in Christ Jesus, and to be completed in Him.—R.] This expression constitutes an antithesis to the *bringing me into captivity*, just as *the law of the Spirit of life* is an antithesis to **the law of sin and death** [τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου.] ‡ Because the false law of sinful propensity in the members is, according to chap. vii. 23, a law of sin, so is it also a law which tends to death, according to ver. 24. Although the Apostle designs to say that this freedom is followed by freedom from the Mosaic law (chap. vi. 14), it is nevertheless utterly wrong to understand, by the expression before us, the moral law (Wolf), or the Mosaic law (Pareus, and others). How far has the believer been *made free* from this law? Evidently, freedom from the dominion of sin (Greek and Roman Catholic expositors), effected by freedom from the penalty of sin (Protestant expositors), is meant. Yet the νόμος πνεύμ. is not altogether identical with the νόμος πίστ. (Calovius). In the law of faith, the emphasis rests on the faith, but here on the νόμος; there, the question is the principle of justification, but here, the principle of holiness. The individualizing με ceases here.

Ver. 3. **For what the law could not do** [τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου]. The Mosaic law was incapable of effecting this liberation; therefore redemption took its place. On account of the connection of thought with the foregoing, the explanatory and appositional conclusion, *what to the law was impossible*, is made antecedent as apposition by Winer, it is defined as an accusative, governed by ἐποίησε (Winer, p. 217, § 32. 7); by Olshausen, as accusative absolute ("as far as the possibility of the law was concerned"); [Hodge: in view of the impotency of the law.—R.]; and by Rückert, Meyer, Fritzsche, and De Wette, as an antecedent nominative. For analogous forms, see Meyer * and Tholuck; particularly κεφάλαιον δέ, Heb. viii. 1 As nominative, the word acquires the character of a superscription, to be introduced with a colon; yet not as "rhetorical emphasis," but as making prominent the difference between law and gospel. Erasmus and Luther supply an ἐποίησε before Θεός, not agreeably to the forms, yet certainly in harmony with the thought. The genitive νόμου denotes the incapacity of the law to deliver from sin (Vater has referred the νόμ. to the law of the Spirit; Schulthess, to the law of Divine and human love).

In that it was weak. The ἐν ᾧ cannot mean *while* here; Meyer translates, *in so far as*, which appears too limited. [Luther, Calvin, Tholuck, De Wette, Philippi, Stuart, Hodge, render *because*, which is demanded by the context.—R.] The ἠσθένει again takes up the idea of incapacity.

Through the flesh [διὰ τῆς σαρκός]. Meyer: Through the guilt of the flesh. Besser: Through effect of the flesh. We must not forget the fact, that the division of the σάρξ has also made out of the law a division of the carnal letter. [The preposition διά with the genitive here marks the medium through which the law proved its weakness and inability, viz., the flesh (in its strict ethical sense). The law acted not on spiritual, but carnal men, and, through this medium, its inability to do what God did in sending His Son was proven.—R.]

God sending his own Son. The Apostle describes the redeeming act of God both in its pertinent meaning and in its medium. The medium was: God sent His own Son (in antithesis to the sending of the law by angels; Gal. iii. 19; Heb. ii. 2); and He sent *him in the likeness of sinful flesh*, or, *of the flesh of sin*, and on account of sin.—*He sent him.* Declaration of preëxistence. [Philippi rightly finds in this verse not only a declaration of the preëxistence of Christ, but of His existence as Son; the description which follows having a *soteriological*, rather than a christological reference. —R.]

In the likeness of sinful flesh [ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας. *Sinful flesh* is not altogether exact. Σάρξ must mean the whole h

* [*Law* is here to be taken in the wide sense as = norm, principle, ruling power (comp. iii. 27; vii. 21-23).—P. S.]

† [Dr. Hodge, following Witsius, takes the law of the spirit of life as = the gospel. His objections to the other views arise mainly from a too exclusive reference of ver. 1 to the forensic idea of justification. It certainly confuses anew the meaning of the word *law*, to adopt this interpretation. Even should it mean gospel, it must mean the gospel in its *life-giving* aspect, as wrought by the Spirit; or Paul would not have chosen such terms. If *in Christ Jesus* be joined with *freed*, then the reference to the objective ground of justification is implied in the statement of our subjective possession of it in Christ Jesus. (See Lange, above.) Agreeing with Calvin, in the main, we interpret: "The power of the life-giving Spirit delivered me in Christ Jesus (in virtue of union to Him the fulfiller of the law and the deliverer from the law) from the law of sin and death."—R.]

‡ [Alford paraphrases: all claim of sin on him is at an end—he is acquitted; but, as he admits, "we are on higher ground now."—R.]

* [The simplest explanation is that of Meyer and Philippi: "God condemned sin in the flesh—a thing which was impossible on the side of the law." This takes it as nominative absolute, passing judgment in advance on what God did, so as to give prominence to the inability of the law, as well as a reason why God did it. On the grammatical objections to taking it as accusative absolute, see Meyer. Ἀδύνατον may be either active, = ἡ ἀδυναμία, or passive, = what was impossible. Tholuck urges the genitive in favor of the former, while Meyer contends that usage supports the latter.—R.]

mal nature; the ethical force, however, lies in the genitive, which defines it: *whose attribute and character was sin* (Alford). The Orthodox fathers (comp. Theodoret, Theophylact, Tertullian) rightly use this text. "Christ did not appear in the flesh of sin, which was the Ebionite view, nor in the likeness of flesh, which was Docetic, but in the likeness of the flesh of sin, which is the Biblico-Pauline view" (Philippi).—R.] As He became truly man, He appeared in the full likeness of sinful flesh (Phil. ii. 7), and yet not in equality with it. Meyer: "So that He appeared in an external form, which was similar to human nature, contaminated with sin. Christ did not appear ἐν σαρκὶ ἁμαρτ., but also not Docetically (contrary to Krehl)." See Tholuck's citation of the views of the Docetæ, and of the Mystics (for example, Valentine Weigel, who held that the external body of Christ came from the Virgin,* but His inward body from heaven), as well as the opposite views of Dippel, Hasenkamp, Menken, and Irving. "According to them, ὁμοίωμα does not denote *likeness*, but *equality*. But although ὅμοιος combines both meanings, yet that of likeness alone belongs to the substantives ὁμοίωμα and ὁμοίωσις; besides, the other meaning is contradicted by the analogy of Scripture in Heb. iv. 15."

And on account of sin [καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας. The καί connects with the preceding. If this be forgotten, the interpretation may be too largely affected by the clause which follows.—R.] This was the motive of His mission. But the connection by καί expresses a second condescension of God and His Son. The first was, that Christ appeared in the form of a sinner, of the servant of sin (see chap. vii.), of the σάρξ ἁμαρτίας, of the false σάρξ; the second, that a mission on account of sin was undertaken by the Son of God himself (see Matt. xxi. 37). "Καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτ. has been connected with κατέκρινε by the Itala (*per carnem*), Tertullian (*de res carn.*, c. 66), the Vulgate (*de peccato*), Chrysostom, Theodoret, Luther, Baldwin, and Bengel. But the καί is against this;" Tholuck. The ἁμαρτία in περὶ ἁμαρτ. itself has been variously interpreted. Thomas Aquinas, of the passion of Christ on account of its likeness to sin; Hermeus, of death; Origen, Pelagius, Melanchthon, Calvin, Bucer, Baumgarten-Crusius, of the sin-offering † חַטָּאת; Theophylact, Maier, and others, the destruction and removal of sin. Meyer: "It is rather *the whole relation* in which the mission of Christ stood to human sin;" but this is already indicated by the foregoing explanation (see 1 John iii. 5). The mission of Christ was related to sin; its aim on every side was its abolition. But the immediate effect of His mission was, that God, by the innocence of Christ's life in the flesh, distinguished and separated sin, as a foreign and damnable object, from the flesh.

Condemned sin in the flesh [κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί. The article is used here with ἁμαρτίαν, *the sin* already referred to. This is a final argument against interpreting "sin" as = sin-offering, in the clause above. Whether "in the flesh" is to be joined with "condemned," or with "sin," is a matter open to discussion (see below).—R.] To the general idea of the mission of Christ: *on account of sin*, this declaration is now added, as a specific idea, to describe what His mission effected in relation to *sin in the flesh*. And we must criticise the different interpretations accordingly. Since the Redeemer, or God through Him, performs a condemnatory deed, we must especially avoid an incorrect generalization of the idea. Erasmus, De Dieu, and Eckermann, have very appropriately pointed out the thought, that He represented sin as damnable; yet we must emphasize *sin in the flesh*, and add: He separated it from the flesh fundamentally in Christ, in order thereby to cast it out from the flesh in the life of believers. This is, therefore, the sense: Christ, by becoming man in the flesh (which appeared to be the source of sin), and yet having a sinless fleshly nature, so maintained this sinlessness, and even holiness of His flesh, through His whole life, that He could give His flesh to His followers as a seal of His favor and as the organ of His Spirit. By this means He made it manifest: 1. That sin does not belong to the flesh in itself, but is inherent in it as a foreign, unnatural, condemnable, separable, alienable, and abstractly spiritual element; 2. That sin in the flesh is condemned and rejected in its carnal appearance; 3. That sin in the flesh should be separated from the entire human nature by means of the Spirit proceeding from Christ.

Other explanations: 1. Allusions to the eradication of the guilt of sin. This "is the prevailing ecclesiastical view in Origen, Chrysostom, &c. So, too, the Catholic expositors, with the exception of Justin; the Protestant, with the exception of Beza; even the Arminian and Socinian writers, and, indeed, the most of the later ones—Usteri, Rückert, Baumgarten-Crusius, Philippi,* and Schmid (*Bibl. Theol.*);" Tholuck. For what has been and can be said in favor of this explanation, see, at length, in Tholuck, p. 392 ff. "Yet the absence of the αὐτοῦ from ἐν τῇ σαρκί (comp., on the contrary, Eph. ii. 5) is an obstacle." We may add, that the context is also an obstacle. The question has been, chap. iii., concerning Christ as the propitiator. Here He is represented as a "fountain of holiness."

2. Allusions to the removal of sinfulness. "The procession of the delivering Spirit of life from Christ is only clearly proved by ver. 3, in case there is in this verse the thought that Christ has gained the victory over sin by His pure and holy personality in His own humanity, and that this sinless Spirit now passes over by faith to believers;" Tholuck. The same writer adduces a number of the defenders of the *obedientia activa*; especially Beza, of the Reformation period; the following later expositors seem also to belong here: Winzer, Stier, Neander, Meyer De Wette, and Hofmann.†—Yet Tholuck finally turns to the allusion of this passage to the guilt of

* [Wordsworth finds in our phrase an argument against the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.—R.]

† [This interpretation, adopted by Hodge and Stuart, is rejected by every German commentator of note, even by Philippi and Alford. The passages in the New Testament (Heb. x. 6, 8, 18; xiii. 11; Gal. i. 4) which seem to favor it, all contain a distinct reference to sacrifices, independently of περὶ ἁμαρ. In Gal. i. 4 (see *in loco* p. 18), the "gave himself" introduces the same thought. The wider meaning, of course, implies such an expiation; but it is not brought prominently forward in this expression. (Philippi: *um die Sünde sühnend zu tilgend*; to which Meyer unnecessarily objects, since his own view includes this.)—R.]

* [See Philippi's view below. Hodge is decided in his preference for this interpretation, regarding all others as arbitrary, and contrary to the context.—R.]

† [So Alford, Schaff. Stuart makes this antithesis with ver. 1: "There is now no κατάκριμα for Christians; but there is a κατάκριμα of their carnal appetites and desires." This he justifies by finding here "a paranomasial use of words;" but this mode of interpretation is of doubtful propriety.—R.]

sin, and thus we must understand by σάρξ (p. 394) not the σάρξ of Christ, but "the sinful human nature, which, although only καθ' ὁμοίωμα, was also possessed by Christ (Philippi, De Wette)." The latter does not belong here. But then there would also follow from this an atonement καθ' ὁμοίωμα. The interpretation of the κατέκρινε by *interfecit* (Grotius, Reiche, &c.), does not suit the nature of Christ. Meyer properly observes, that the κατέκρινε has been chosen in reference to the κατάκριμα in ver. 1. If we thus condemn ourselves, we shall not be condemned; and if that condemnatory process against sin in the flesh has passed from Christ upon us, the object of the future condemnation is removed.

[Besides these views, Philippi advocates a primary reference to the death of Christ, but includes the fact that thus sin is *eo ipso* done away and extirpated, so that those who are in Christ Jesus have both the pardon and the removal of sin, because of the indissoluble unity of both in Him.* This suits the wider meaning of *no condemnation* (ver. 1). All interpretations deviate from the strict meaning of the verb; the reference to punishment involves an added thought, not less than that to the extirpation of sin. Besides, the law *could* condemn sin, and, to a certain extent, punish it; but its great weakness was its inability to remove sin. It is perfectly gratuitous to infer that the modern interpretation implies that we are justified on the ground of inherent goodness, since this assumes that ver. 1 refers only to declarative righteousness, and overlooks the fact that the controlling thought is *union to Christ*. Still, should any prefer to find here an allusion to Christ's passion as a penal condemnation of sin, it must be allowed as involved, though this must not then be used to force the same meaning on the next verse.—R.]

[*In the flesh*. This is referred by many to the human nature of Christ. Were this the exclusive reference, we would probably find αὐτοῦ. The ethical sense must be adopted by those who join it with *sin*; but against this is the meaning of sin as a principle (Alford), and also the indifferent sense of σάρξ in the earlier part of the verse. It is better, then, to join it with the verb, and include in it human nature, our human nature, which Christ shared.† This seems to be Dr. Lange's view, though he adds to it some remarks which seem to echo his pseudo-plasmatic interpretation of chap. vii. We paraphrase the whole verse: "What could not be done by the law (was thus done), God sending His own Son in the likeness of that flesh, which was characterized by sin, and, on account of sin, condemned entirely (both as to punitive and polluting effects) in that flesh (which He shared with us) that sin." Yet this is not an accomplished fact as respects our release from the power of sin; that is *to be* fulfilled, and this end (ἵνα) is set forth in the next verse.—R.]

Plainly, this verse declares the condemnableness of the sinful propensity. An expression of Irenæus is important for the interpretation of this passage. *condemnavit peccatum et jam quasi condemnatum ejecit extra carnem*. The beautiful words of Augustine denote the objective medium by which the sinlessness of Christ becomes our liberation: *Quomodo liberavit? Nisi quia reatum peccatorum omnium remissione dissolvit, ita ut, quamvis adhuc maneat, in peccatum non imputetur*. Yet Beza properly observes: *Neque nunc Apostolus agit de Christi morte, et nostrorum peccatorum expiatione, sed de Christi incarnatione, et naturæ nostræ corruptione per eam sublata*. Only, as far as the transmission of sinlessness from Christ to us is concerned, we must bear in mind chap. vi. 1 ff. By virtue of the connection of Christ with us, He has redeemed us; by virtue of His connection with us in our guilty misery, He has atoned for us; and by virtue of the connection of His nature with our flesh, He has given His flesh to die, in order that, in His spiritual position toward us, He might make us free from the flesh by the communion of His Spirit as spiritual man, and, with the flesh of His risen life, implant in us a sanctified nature for the future resurrection.

Ver. 4. **That the righteousness** [or **requirement**] **of the law** [ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου. Ἵνα, telic, introducing the purpose of the condemnation of sin in the flesh. Lange renders δικαίωμα: *Gerechtsein*. On the word, see p. 184. Stuart: the *precept* of the law; Hodge: the demands of the law (and also, the sentence of justification); Alford (following Meyer): all the requirements of the law combined here as one. Perhaps it is more exact to paraphrase: that righteous act (viewing all the acts as a unit) which meets the requirements of the law. This is Lange's view.—R.]. Meyer explains the δικαίωμα ("quite simply, as chap. i. 32; ii. 26; comp. also chap. v. 16") as the requirement of the law; that which the law stipulates. Yet we have seen above, that δικαίωμα is that which satisfies and fulfils the law. The righteousness of life shall proceed from the righteousness of faith. Or, as the former proceeds originally from the latter as freedom in Christ, so shall it also proceed actually from it in more gradual fulfilment—in the holiness of our life. The surprise of the expositors at the explanation of Chrysostom and Theodoret, ὁ σκοπὸς τοῦ νόμου (see Tholuck, p. 396), is therefore without ground. Certainly that cannot mean, that the purpose of the law is to justify, but that it is its limit and end; see Rom. xiii. 10. Explanations:

1. The *imputatio* of Christ's righteousness. Calvin: The transferrence to us of the destruction of guilt which Christ effected (Bullinger, Beza, Calixtus [Hodge], and others). Also the transferrence of Christ's obedience to us (Brenz, Aretius [Haldane, apparently]: therefore also the *obedientia activa*). Köllner, Fritzsche, and Philippi: The *sententia absolutoria* is meant. Tholuck properly suggests, that the πληροῦν and the ἐν are against these interpretations.

2. The principle of the righteousness of life imparted to believers. This view seems to indicate a slight fear of the thought that Christians shall be holy in the form of believing spontaneity. Tholuck cites Meyer's view: "in order that this fulfilment of the law become apparent in the whole conduct," and adds (in accordance with Olshausen), "then Christians would be regarded as though they were only the possessors of a principle fulfilling the law."

* [So Wordsworth, Webster and Wilkinson, Forbes. This view is, indeed, open to the charge of indefiniteness; but as the clause sets forth both what the law could not do, and what God did do in sending Jesus Christ, there can be little objection to a wide meaning here, provided ver. 4 be applied definitely to the work of sanctification. Dr. Lange himself in the next paragraph reaches the same point.—R.]

† [Wordsworth: "Sin had tyrannised over us *in* our flesh, as the seat of its empire; and by our flesh, as its instrument and weapon. But God used our flesh as an instrument for our deliverance, and for the condemnation of sin, and for the establishment of his own empire in us." —R.]

3. The real holiness of believers proceeding from the principle of the righteousness of faith. [So Tholuck, Olshausen, Meyer, Alford, John Brown, and many others; among them some who refer the previous verse to the vicarious sacrifice of Christ.—R.] The passive form (instead of πληρώσωμεν) is a safeguard against a semi-Pelagian misconstruction. De Wette: *in our inward activity of life.* Reiche and Klee give special prominence therewith to the real inwardness of the fulfilment of the law.

[**Might be fulfilled in us,** πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν. The verb is passive. The fulfilment is wrought by God. *In us;* not by us, not *on us* (some shade of this meaning is involved in all those interpretations which refer the verse to imputed righteousness or holiness), and certainly not *among us.* The only objection to be considered is that of Calvin, and others: that, in this sense, the fulfilment does not take place. Granted—not at once, nor in this life, perhaps; but surely this must be the end (comp. Eph. ii. 10; Col. i. 22), and that it is in the Apostle's mind here, is evident from the latter part of the chapter.—R.]

Who walk not according to the flesh, &c. [τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα. Κατά may be expanded into: *according to the impulses of* (so Meyer). These phrases express the actual life of those *in the flesh* and *in the Spirit.*—R.] This addition states not only the characteristic, but also the necessary condition * of believers. Tholuck holds that the participial clause does not contain the condition, as many of the earlier expositors maintain, but only the specification of the method. Meyer holds, that κατὰ πνεῦμα designates only the sanctifying Divine principle itself, as objective, and different from the human πνεῦμα! But it must not be viewed subjectively as the pneumatic nature of the regenerate, restored by the Holy Spirit, as (in accordance with Chrysostom) held by Bengel, Rückert, Philippi, and others. We would then have to ask at once, whether there is not another expression for the human spiritual life in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit? Further, whence the antagonism of the Holy Spirit and the human σάρξ, since the most direct antithesis would be man's unholy spiritual life? Universally, wherever the question is the antithesis of spirit and flesh in man himself, man is nevertheless considered as man, and not merely as flesh. [To this position of Dr. Lange there are decided objections. On the whole subject, the reader is referred to the Excursus, p. 285. It is better to hold (with Meyer, Alford, Hodge, and many others, against Stuart, Philippi, Lange, &c.), that πνεῦμα here refers to the Holy Spirit, and not to the spiritual nature imparted by the Holy Spirit, or the subjective spiritual life-principle (Lange). This seems to be required by ver. 2 ("the law of the Spirit of life") and ver. 5 ("the things of the Spirit"), where πνεῦμα evidently means the Holy Spirit.—The E. V. has very properly expressed this by the use of the capital letter.—R.]

SECOND PARAGRAPH, VERS. 5-8.

Ver. 5. **For those who are according to the flesh** [οἱ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες]. The εἶναι κατὰ σάρκα is identical with the εἶναι ἐν σαρκί, and the latter means, *to be in the carnal principle,* under the supposition that the σάρξ is the absolute principle of life. This εἶναι, as the controlling tendency of life, is the source of the φρονεῖν, and the φρονεῖν is the *causa efficiens* of the περιπατεῖν.—Meyer says that this expression is a wider notion than that conveyed by "who walk after the flesh," which is not the case.* Tholuck explains εἶναι κατά τι: "To bear in one's self the qualities of something; therefore = οἱ σαρκικοί." But it is these, first of all, in their principle of life, which then certainly results in the walk in the flesh. [It may be admitted that the principle of life is more prominent than the ethical state in this verse. Yet the phrases, "in the flesh" and "according to the flesh" (especially the former) include the characteristic state as well. Hence the view of Tholuck is preferable.—R.]

Do mind the things of the flesh [τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονοῦσιν. The verb means, *think of,* care for, strive after (Alford). Meyer notices the presence of the article, making σάρξ objective, as though it were something independent. This accords with the view, that Spirit here is the objective and operative Holy Spirit.—R.] The false objects of the desires of the false independence of the flesh. The antithesis, **those who are according to the Spirit,** οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα, completes the thought that the two tendencies totally exclude each other.—[It also follows that τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, **the things of the Spirit,** *which belong to the Holy Spirit,* and hence to the spiritual life, exclude the things of the flesh. Dr. Hodge well remarks, therefore, that the latter phrase means "not merely sensual things, but all things which do not belong to the category of the things of the Spirit."—R.]

Ver. 6. **For the mind of the flesh is death** [τὸ γὰρ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος]. The connection here formed by γάρ is singular. Tholuck: "It could serve to prove only the second half of ver. 5, while the correspondence of the members of the sentence leads us to expect a proof of both halves of ver. 5. Thus the view gains probability, that, according to the Greek and Hebrew (כִּי) use of language, the proof in ver. 6 performs for that in ver. 5 the parallel service of assigning reasons for the τοῖς μή, κ.τ.λ., in ver. 4." Meyer makes the γάρ the proof of the second half of ver 5, οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα. "Motive why they make the interests of the πνεῦμα the end of their efforts." † We regard, however, the γάρ as proof that the εἶναι κατὰ has a corresponding φρονεῖν and φρόνημα ‡ as a result. For the σάρξ has a φρόνημα, yet all its φρόνημα is nothing but death;

* [This seems doubtful. It is true that this is a condition of the final fulfilment, a condition which implies the Divine Spiritual power as its cause; but this is not the idea which is prominent here. The method is now introduced, so as to point out, in what follows, the difference between the workings of the law of the Spirit of life, and the law of sin and death, which find their corresponding expressions in the phrases: according to the Spirit, according to the flesh.—R.]

* [It were better to say that it is the same idea under a different aspect. In ver. 4, with reference to the outward life; here, with reference to the actual state.—R.]

† [In 4th ed., Meyer agrees with Tholuck, taking this second γάρ as explicative, according to classical usage. So Rückert, Stuart, Hodge. (De Wette, Alford, follow the view attributed to Meyer above.) The contrast, already indicated in ver. 4, is continued here.—R.]

‡ [Φρόνημα (Lange: *Gesinnung;* Bengel: *sentiment,* in the French) means the disposition, which manifests itself in the φρονεῖν (ver. 5). The E. V. is therefore correct in thought, though not in form.—R.]

not only aiming at death against its will, but also proceeding from death, moving in the element of death; that is, in constant dissolution of the unity between life and its source of life, between spiritual and physical life, and even between the opposition of the desires of the individual members. [The copula, to be supplied here, is not, *has as its results*, but, *is*, *amounts to*. Philippi: "Death is here conceived as present (comp. 1 Tim. v. 6; Eph. ii. 1, 5), not merely as a result, but as a characteristic mark, an immanent definition of the carnal mind."—R.]

[**But the mind of the Spirit,** τὸ δὲ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος.] The opposite is the φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος (for the εἶναι κατὰ πν. is itself πν.); it is **life and peace.*** It is therefore from true life, moving in life, directed *to life*. Peace means the soul of life. Opposition is the separation and dissolution of life; peace with God is connection with the source of life; peace with one's self, a blessed sense of life; peace with the government of God and His world, an infinitely richer life. The third characteristic must be specially emphasized in both clauses: *directed* to the end: life and peace.

Ver. 7. **Because the mind of the flesh.** [Διότι introduces a proof, here confined to the former half of ver. 6. This proof hints at an antithesis to both life and peace, the latter being more evident, as it is in human consciousness also.—R.] The reason why φρόνημα, &c., = θαν., lies in its opposition to the source of life, its **enmity against God** [ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν], with which the displeasure of God necessarily corresponds.† Since the Apostle does not prove the second half, it follows that here the effort of the flesh constitutes the principal point of view. Enmity against God is, in the first degree, the actual opposition to God in almost unknown (but not unconscious) form; but afterwards the opposition established also in the consciousness. Melanchthon appropriately says: "*Loquitur Paulus principaliter de cogitationibus de deo, quales sunt in mente non renata, in qua simul magna confusio est dubitationum, deinde et de affectibus erga deum. In securis est contemtus judicii dei, in perpere factis indignatio et fremitus adversus deum.*"

For it does not submit itself to the law of God [τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται. The verb is middle. *The law of God* is in emphatic position. The clause proves what precedes, by adducing a fact. This mode of proof concurs with the statements already made respecting man's character and that of the law.—R.] Paul's positive declaration of the manifestation of this enmity. This enmity, which is very deep-seated, becomes manifest in disobedience to, and rebellion against, God's law.

Neither indeed can it [οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται]. Subjection to the law of God is not possible on the carnal standpoint. Or rather, it cannot be effected by carnal effort. A divided life, according to the blind course of the lusts, is in outright contradiction to the central procession of life from within, according to the principle of the Spirit. Tholuck justly opposes Zeller, by bringing out the fact, that the antithesis is not man's sensuous and spiritual nature in itself, but that σάρξ denotes human nature with the accessory idea of its sinful character. But to this it may be said, that the question is not the σάρξ in itself, but a φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός; that is, a σάρξ morbidly excited and demonized by a selfish spirituality. [Comp. the Excursus in chap. vii. That chapter is a proof of this declaration. The fact is undoubted. Paul is but declaring the cause of the manifestation of enmity to God in the form of opposition to His law, the *inability* of the carnal man to be subject to it. The question of ability to believe is not under discussion, yet Pelagianism and legalism are obviously precluded by this statement.—R.]

Ver. 8. **And those who are in the flesh cannot please God** [οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύνανται. The E. V strengthens δέ into *so then*, following Beza, Calvin, and others, who made it = οὖν. (So Hodge.) It is much better, with De Wette, Philippi, Meyer, to consider it metabatic. It continues the thought of the first clause of ver. 7. There seems to be no necessity for assuming a suppressed μέν, as Alford does. On this account we render *and* instead of *but*.—R.] Ὄντες ἐν σαρκί = ὄντες κατὰ σάρκα, but the expression here is stronger; see above. The incapacity in ver. 8, then, follows from the incapacity of ver. 7. It is said, in a mild way, that they are objects of the Divine displeasure, children of wrath. But the expression is significant, in that it destroys the notion of those who are legalists, and rely on the righteousness of their works, and who, although ὄντες ἐν σαρκί, fancy that they can merit the pleasure of God by their works and endeavors. For we must by no means lose sight of the fact, that the Apostle does not speak merely of the gross service of sin, but also of an observance of the law, which accepts the law as merely external, as γράμμα and σάρξ. [The connection renders obvious what is distinctly stated elsewhere, that this is no negative position, involving only negative results. The mind of the flesh is *death*.—R.]

THIRD PARAGRAPH, VERS. 9–11.

Ver. 9. **But ye are not in the flesh, &c.** [ὑμεῖς δέ, κ.τ.λ. Δέ is distinctive (Stuart).—**If so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you,** εἴπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν]. The antithesis. The more specific exhortation does not appear here, but in ver. 12. The εἴπερ may be thus distinguished from εἴγε: it (= "provided that") generally expresses slight doubt, while εἴγε expresses rather an assurance in the sense of *if indeed*. Yet the εἴπερ here must be understood as only purely conditional, in conformity with the antithesis by which the Apostle represents the standpoint of the spiritual life of believers as purely fundamental and ideal. With such a representation, the application to individuals can only take place with an εἴπερ; likewise without positive doubt. Chrysostom and Olshausen take it as ἐπειδήπερ, *quando quidem*; Tholuck and Meyer prefer the hortatory construction, on account of the antithesis. [It seems most natural to account for the conditional form, by admitting "an indirect incitement to self-examination" (Meyer). Πνεῦμα is without the article, yet it must mean the Holy Spirit; hence

* [Meyer, who, as usual, limits "death" to eternal death, must define "life" in the same way. *Life* is the direct antithesis to *death*; but a subjective characteristic is added, as Bengel suggests, to prepare the way for the following description of enmity.—R.]

† [It is easy to construct this inference: The mind of the flesh = death; because the mind of the flesh = enmity against God: therefore, enmity against God = death.—R.]

we claim this as its usual meaning throughout the passage. The use of πνεύματι, seemingly in distinction from πνεῦμα, is not against this, since, in the first clause, the Spirit is represented as the *element* in which they live; in the second, as the indwelling power causing them to live in this element.—On οἰκεῖ, comp. 1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 17, 19; 2 Tim. i. 14; John xiv. 23.—*In you* must not be weakened to *among* you.—R.]

Now if any man hath not, &c. [εἰ δέ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει. The antithesis is not very strong; δέ may well be rendered *now* (E. V.). The unconditional negative belongs to the verb (Alford). See *Textual Note* [8].—R.] This antithetical declaration certainly expresses the possibility, that what has been said has no reference to particular individuals, and that here no half measures are of any avail.

The Spirit of Christ. The question here is, *belonging to Christ;* hence, the Spirit of Christ. It is the Spirit of God as the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of His righteousness of life as brought home to the inward life of believers. [There can be no reasonable doubt that it is identical with *Spirit of God*, above; though the connection with "none of His" has occasioned the use of this particular phrase. The genitive is possessive, Spirit belonging to, or proceeding from, Christ. Comp. Phil. i. 19; Gal. iv. 6; 1 Peter i. 11. Notice the terms, "Spirit of God," "Spirit of Christ," "Christ," all applied to the Divine spiritual indwelling. Hence Bengel well says: *Testimonium illustre de sancta Trinitate ejusque œconomia in corde fidelium.* It must be admitted that such statements generally have reference to the economy of grace, but they form the basis for the doctrinal statements of the Church. This text is therefore a *dictum probans* for the Western doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son (*filioque*, Synod of Toledo, A. D. 589). This was the final contribution to the doctrinal statement of the Trinity. On its importance, &c., see Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, iii., pp. 688 f.; comp. Kahnis, *Lehre vom Heiligen Geiste*, Halle, 1847. Philippi has an excellent note *in loco*. On the relation of the Holy Spirit to Christ, comp. John xiv. 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7, 13, 14.—R.]

[**He is none of his,** οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ.] The Apostle does not regard a merely external belonging to Christ as of any value. Where the Christianity of the inward life is extinct, there the Christianity of the whole man is extinct. Meyer: "Not those who are not Christians, but nominal Christians."

Ver. 10. **But if Christ is in you** [εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν]. That is, as a principle of life. [Δέ contrasts with the last verse. (*Is* is substituted for *be*, to indicate the strong probability that this is the case.) Comp. John vi. 56; xv. 4; 2 Cor. xiii. 5; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. iii. 17; Col. i. 27; also John xiv. 23, as justifying the remark of Bengel: *Qui Spiritum habet, Christum habet; qui Christum habet, Deum habet.* The mystical union of Christ and the believer has, as its underlying basis, the yet more mysterious unity of the Persons of the Godhead.—R.]

The body is dead [τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρόν]. Explanations of vers. 10, 11: *

1. Death and life in their strict sense. Therefore the body lapsed to death (Augustine, Beza, Bengel [*mortuum pro moriturum*], Usteri, Rückert, and Fritzsche). [So Hodge, Alford, Wordsworth.] According to Meyer, the νεκρός is proleptic: "Ye have the following blessed results to enjoy: although the body is a prey to death because of sin, yet the spirit is life because of righteousness. But He who raised Christ will also raise your mortal bodies, because the Spirit of Christ dwelleth in you." [In favor of this view are: the natural sense of *dead*, the connection with ver. 11, and the subsequent course of thought; its not attaching an ethical meaning to body. Against it: the comprehensive meaning of *death* throughout this part of the Epistle, the necessity for a wide meaning in its antithesis ζωή, as well as in ζωοποιήσει (ver. 11, not ἐγερεῖ); also the use of σῶμα in an implied ethical sense in ver. 13.—R.]

2. The body is dead, slain by sin (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Erasmus, Grotius, Baumgarten-Crusius [Stuart], and others. [These, for the most part, take ver. 10 in a moral or spiritual sense. This view is most objectionable, since it disturbs the harmony of the two verses, takes σῶμα in a strict ethical sense, and gives to νεκρόν (which seems to be chosen rather to avoid a direct antithesis to ζωή) the widest possible meaning.—R.]

3. The misery of sin as bearing in itself the germ of death (De Wette, and others). [De Wette claims that the physical and ethical senses must be combined here, as in John v. 21 ff. This view is sufficiently correct if properly restricted. The physical death of the body is to be viewed as a moral result of the indwelling sin, but only because the body has not yet shared in the full results of redemption—R.]

But all this does not furnish us with the definition, that, on account of sin—that is, because of sinfulness—*we have to lead a divinely partial life from the principle of the Spirit*, in which the body is declared to be dead in an ideal and dynamical respect (see chap. vi. 4). *But thereby the spirit as life, and the principle of life, is concentrated still more in itself.* [The objection to this view is, its confusion of human spirit and Divine Spirit, on which the whole interpretation rests.—R.]

But the spirit is life [τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωή]. Meyer also holds, that here the spirit is not the Holy Spirit (as Chrysostom, Calvin, and others suppose), but the human spirit. Although the human spirit is here regarded as filled by the Holy Spirit, we must not include (with Philippi, following Theodoret and De Wette) the pneumatic nature of the regenerate. For, says Meyer, that must *remain there.* [The meaning is evidently that under III. B. in the Excursus above, p. 235.—R.] Ζωή, *life*, not merely living, but life which is thoroughly actual, life-giving, and life-supporting. [Whatever view be taken of *dead*, the change in the form here, from the adjective to the noun, warrants an extension of meaning; as indeed the word ζωή itself, and its reference to the human spirit permeated by the Divine Spirit, demand.—R.]

Because of sin [διὰ ἁμαρτίαν, *on account of sin*, as an indwelling principle. Not the special sins of the body, nor that the body is the special seat of sin; but, having shared in the results of sin, it has not yet shared in the results of redemption. How and when it will, is afterwards stated.—R.] As this can only mean, to constitute a pure opposition to the sinful propensity cleaving to

* [For fuller discussions, see Tholuck, Meyer, and De Wette *in loco*.—R.]

the members, so can because of righteousness [διὰ δικαιοσύνην] only mean, to maintain and develop the righteousness of faith in the righteousness of life. According to Meyer, the *justitia imputata* is meant, as the foundation of the ζωή. (The most of the elder expositors, together with Rückert, &c., favor the same view.) But then the διά would have to be construed with the genitive. The reference to the righteousness of life (Erasmus, Grotius, De Wette, Philippi [Hodge, Alford], and others) is opposed by Meyer in the words: "Because the righteousness of life can never be perfect, it can never be the ground of the ζωή. But the question is not the ground of the ζωή, but the greater promotion of life, so that it may prove itself to be purer life. The concern is, to preserve spotless the white robe of bestowed righteousness, and, being clad in it, to strive for the crown of righteousness." (Meyer holds, according to this, that the ἁμαρτ. does not imply our own individual sin, and thus, too, that the δικ. does not imply our own "righteousness.") In harmony with the sense, many expositors, particularly Calixtus, connect the *justitia imputata* with the *inchoata*.*

Ver. 11. **But if the Spirit** [εἰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα]. The Apostle here prepares his transition from his description of *adoption*, regarded *as a partial spiritual life*, to his description of the *glory* in which *body and spirit shall be in perfect harmony*, when the body shall be glorified into the perfect organ of the Spirit. Meyer thus construes the connection: "After ver. 10, death still retains some power—that over the body; Paul now removes this."

Of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, &c. [τοῦ ἐγείραντος Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν, κ.τ.λ.]. The spiritual resurrection must be followed by the physical; it is a prophecy of the physical resurrection. For the author of the spiritual resurrection is the Spirit of the wonder-working God, which has raised Christ, and elevated Him to the majesty of the glorified life. What the Spirit [now dwelling in you] has done to Him, in conformity with the connection of body and spirit, He will also do to His members (see Eph. i. 19 ff.). He has raised Jesus *from the dead*—that is, as the first-fruits of the resurrection. Therefore He

Will quicken even your mortal bodies, &c. [ζωοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν, κ.τ.λ. The use of the word θνητά, *mortal*, immediately after νεκρόν (ver. 10) seems to justify the reference of the latter to physical death; as, indeed, σώματα here opposes any ethical sense of that word in ver. 10. Since, however, the verb ζωοποιεῖν is one of wide meaning, a large number of commentators (Calvin, Stuart, De Wette, Philippi, and others) refer this verse also to something which takes place even here, to be completed, indeed, at the time of actual resurrection. Against this is the καί, *also*, *even*, which is unnecessary, unless the reference be to something which has not yet taken place, and which seemed most unlikely to take place. The quickening of the body, as a tool of unrighteousness, has already begun. The objection of Stuart, that then this would only mean to declare the bodily resurrection, a truth already well known, betrays a want of appreciation of the importance attached to that truth by the Apostle. Furthermore, even admitting a secondary reference to a present moral quickening of the body, the primary reference to the actual physical resurrection seems to be demanded by the experience of Christians, which certainly shows them that the last seat, both of the strength and the effects of sin, is in the body. It does not revive; no spiritual power here renews it. It is mortal, yet even it shall share in the life-giving influence. The verb means more than raising from the dead indeed, but, as used here, the emphasis rests on this.—R.]

[**On account of his Spirit that dwelleth in you**, διὰ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ἐν ὑμῖν. See *Textual Note* [11]]. We have decided above for the accusative, δια τὸ ἐνοικοῦν, in opposition to the genitive. We do this for important reasons. The Spirit which dwells in believers prepares the resurrection-body; but the resurrection is thereby only provided for. The resurrection itself is still to be the final deed of God. And this is the question here (see ver. 18). But it is a miraculous deed of God, which is not only occasioned, but also brought to pass, by the presence of the Spirit of life in believers.

The change of terms is remarkable: *Jesus* and *Christ*. [Bengel: *Appellatio* JESU *spectat ad ipsum;* CHRISTI, *refertur ad nos;* true even to its eschatological reference (Meyer).—R.]

If, now, the ζωοποιήσει also refers to the resurrection, the choice of the expression yet indicates, at the same time, the holiness of the corporealness by the operation of the resurrection-power of the Spirit, as this holiness constitutes the transition and interposition for the final miracle of the resurrection (see 2 Cor. v. 5). From the very nature of the case, the question here can be neither an ethical vivification alone, nor a physical one alone; but the idea of vivification comprises both these (according to Calvin, De Wette, Philippi, and others). Calvin: "*Non de ultima resurrectione*,* *quæ momento fiet, habetur sermo, sed de continua spiritus operatione, quæ reliquias carnis paulatim mortificans cœlestem vitam in nobis instaurat.*" But De Wette properly observes, against the notion that the spiritual power of resurrection alone can consummate the process of renewal (in conformity with the reading διὰ τοῦ, &c.), that the Jewish opinion that the Holy Ghost quickens the dead (Shamoth Rabba, &c.) cannot prove any thing here.

FOURTH PARAGRAPH, VERS. 12–17.

Ver. 12. **Therefore, brethren** [ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί. An inferential exhortation. In chap. vi. 12 a similar exhortation is found, but without ἀδελφοί. The first person naturally follows.—R.] The ἄρα draws an inference from the necessity of leading the life in the Spirit in opposition to the life in the flesh, in hope of the reanimation of the body. Tholuck says, though not in the sense of the textual construction: "The Apostle allows himself to be led off from the train of thought commencing with

* [Accepting δικ. as implanted righteousness, we paraphrase as follows: But if Christ be in you, (though) your body indeed is dead (having in it the seeds of death, and about to die) on account of sin (whose effects are not yet totally removed), but your spirit (permeated by the Holy Spirit) is life (already and to be yet more truly so) on account of righteousness (implanted in you by the Holy Spirit, in virtue of your union to Christ).—R.]

* [As Alford suggests: *non solum de ultima resurrectione*, would be more correct. For a very full discussion, both of the textual variations and the exegetical opinions see Meyer *in loco*. He defends the exclusive reference to the resurrection of the body.—R.]

vers 10 and 11, by the necessity of an exhortation, and afterwards returns from another point to the eschatological expression."

We are debtors, not to the flesh [ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν οὐ τῇ σαρκί. The negative applies to the succeeding clause as well. The antithesis is obvious. Σάρξ has the article here, where it is personified, but not in the next clause, where it corresponds with the use made of it in vers. 4 and 5.—R.] According to Meyer, the Apostle has suppressed his antithesis in consequence of the vivacious movement of his language. But he was prevented by something else—namely, a desire to guard against misunderstanding, as if Christians had no duties in reference to their flesh or their physical life (comp. Eph. v. 29). [So Chrysostom; see Alford *in loco*.—R.] Therefore he defines his proposition more specifically: *not* **to live after the flesh** [τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν]; that is, not to live according to the principle of carnal desires, or of external motives at all. The genitive τοῦ is sufficiently explained as designation of the infinitive of result. (Fritzsche takes another view; see Meyer.)* The antithesis, *after the Spirit*, follows indirectly in ver. 13.

Ver. 13. **Ye shall die** [μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν]. Strictly, then ye shall go continually to death, or, toward death (μέλλετε). Meyer understands this to mean here only eternal death. This is contrary to Philippi, who properly retains the general idea of death.† According to Rückert, this declaration would exclude the resurrection. But the Apostle takes cognizance not only of the difference between the first and second resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 23), but also of a resurrection which begins immediately after death (2 Cor. v. 1); and pure life is in antithesis to a final resurrection to judgment. The explanation of Œcumenius, τὸν ἀθάνατον θάνατον ἐν τῇ γεέννῃ, precludes neither the resurrection on the one hand, nor, on the other, a constant connection of physical and psychical corruption with ethical corruption.

But if ye through the Spirit [εἰ δὲ πνεύματι. Πνεύματι here is undoubtedly not subjective, but the Holy Spirit (comp. ver. 14). An instrumental dative.—R.] By means of the life of the Spirit (by virtue of the Holy Spirit, says Meyer). Therefore the Apostle says, the deeds of the body should be mortified, not by bodily exercise, restraint, and penance, but by the power of the life of the Spirit.

The deeds [τὰς πράξεις]. The stratagems. Machinations (Luke xxiii. 51; Col. iii. 9). These consist in the predominance of illegal impulses as irresistible necessities, as proofs of liberty, as the poetry of life, &c. The word occurs in the later Greek writers in the meaning of cunning designs, especially in relation to sins of lust (see Tholuck).‡ Yet the general treatment in the present section requires a general interpretation of the word.

[**Of the body,** τοῦ σώματος. See *Textual Note* [13].] The expression σώματος has been very strange to many; therefore Codd. D. E. F. G., and the Vulgate, read σάρκος. Τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, chap. vi. 6, cannot be cited in favor of the expression, since the question here is a real body, but not there. Yet Meyer correctly asserts, contrary to Stirm, that Paul remained true to his customary use of language. The body has its autonomous desires, which express themselves faithfully in the normal life of man, and willingly subordinate themselves to the dominion of the Spirit. In the sinful man, who is not converted, these express themselves as imperious commands. In the believer, on the contrary, from whom the law in the members is removed, they can morbidly express themselves still, though in only deceptive forms, and so far as the body, which should be the organ of the spirit, is autonomous in unguarded moments. But its πράξεις are then motions of the σάρξ, which appear as πράξεις of the body, because the body has its physiological rights. [Thus we avoid giving an ethical sense to *body*. If the bad sense of *deeds* be emphasized, then the ethical force is found there. We must avoid, on the other hand, taking the phrase, "deeds of the body," as metonyme for sinful, carnal deeds (Stuart, Hodge); for there must be a reason for the choice of this word. Alford, following De Wette, explains it: "= τῆς σαρκός, but here concrete, to give more vivid reality."—R.]

Θανατοῦτε [comp. chap. vii. 4, and the stronger expression, νεκρώσατε, Col. iii. 5; Lange's *Comm.*, pp. 63, 64.—R.] *Mortify* can only mean: exhaust and abnegate to the very root. Wicked practises, as roots of sin, are included.

Ye shall live [ζήσεσθε. Alford: "not μέλλετε ζῆν; this *life* being no natural consequence of a course of mortifying the deeds of the body, but the gift of God through Christ; and coming, therefore, in the form of an assurance, '*ye shall live*,' from Christ's Apostle."—R.] In the higher, and even highest sense.

Ver. 14. **For as many as are led by the Spirit of God** [ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται. Comp. Gal. v. 18. Lange's *Comm.*, p. 137. Γάρ introduces the reason why they shall live, implying, at the same time, that such mortification was the result of the Spirit's influence, as is expressed in ver. 13. Hence πνεῦμα, in the former case, must refer to the Spirit of God. That this leading means a continued and special influence of the Divine Spirit, is obvious.—R.] The Spirit of God is not identical with the Spirit in ver. 13 (Meyer); but it is Christian spiritual life, *to be led by the Spirit of God.* The passive form expresses its complete dominion, without at the same time denying the voluntary *being led* on the part of the human will.

They are sons of God [οὗτοι υἱοί εἰσιν θεοῦ. See *Textual Note* [14]. The reading adopted here places the emphasis on οὗτοι, *these, and none other*, but gives a secondary emphasis to υἱοί; comp. Gal. iii. 7. Philippi finds no essential difference between υἱοί and τέκνα θεοῦ, except that, in the former, the idea of maturity is more prominent. Hence Christ is called υἱός, never τέκνον θεοῦ. (So Alford.) On the significance of the phrase, see *Doctr. Note* [10], and the *Exeg. Notes* on vers. 15, 16.—R.] *Sons*, in the real sense, in contrast with the

* [Stuart follows Winer, p. 306, in governing the genitive by ὀφειλέται (so Fritzsche). This is harsh, and most commentators take the genitive as that of design or result, according to a very common usage.—R.]

† [The most comprehensive idea of death seems to be demanded by the context. Granting that the antithesis is ζωή (ver. 10), the present and spiritual reference is still required. Ver. 6 forms the best guide to the meaning of the terms here (so Tholuck).—R.]

‡ [The New Testament uses the word generally *in malam partem*; and so here, whether in a more or less restricted sense. It does not refer to the definite acts so strictly as ἔργα, but includes the general conduct, &c. (Philippi).—R.]

symbolical children of God of the old theocracy. It is those, and those alone, who bear in themselves the mark that the Spirit of God leads them. On the other hand, the merely symbolical adoption by God under the law is strictly a bondage, according to ver. 15. Comp. Gal. v. 18.

Ver. 15. **For ye did not receive the spirit of bondage** [οὐ γαρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας. An appeal to Christian consciousness, to confirm (γάρ) his statement. The verb is aorist, referring to a definite time (when they became Christians).—R.] Meyer translates: "*A* spirit of bondage, adoption." We hold that the definitions are sufficiently united by the exclusive antithesis. What must we understand by the expression, *spirit of bondage?* Tholuck: "The negative form of this clause caused the earlier expositors great difficulty, since the question is not a communication of the spirit in the Old Testament, and since the spirit there imparted, so far as it was a spirit of bondage, could not be derived from God; and finally, as the πνεῦμα, which, in consequence of the antithesis of πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας, must be viewed as the Holy Spirit, could produce the spirit of bondage." Explanations:

1. Augustine incidentally: The devil is the author of the slavish spirit (Heb. ii. 14, 15). Luther: The spirit of Cain in opposition to Abel's spirit of grace (Fritzsche: *malus dæmon*, &c.).

2. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Œcumenius: The gift of the law itself, as πνευματική, according to chap. vii. 14. Likewise Augustine, elsewhere: The spirit of the external gift of the law: *idem spiritus in tabulis lapideis in timore, in tabulis cordis in dilectione.*

3. Most of the later expositors: The same Holy Spirit is described in His twofold operation; here, as far as He exercises His penal office (John xvi. 8). In that case, the operation of the mere *attritio* not designed by the Spirit is made prominent.

4. Grotius, Philippi, and others: πν. is in both cases a subjective spiritual disposition. [Philippi defends this view very ably. Stuart: a servile spirit; a filial spirit. Alford admits also the subjective sense. De Wette remarks, that the objective source is indicated in the verb "received."—R.]

5. Fritzsche, Meyer, and Tholuck: πν. δουλ denotes what the received filial spirit is not. Likewise Monachus, in the seventh century. Therefore the spirit of bondage is regarded as a hypothetical antithesis. This is undoubtedly correct, in a measure, so far as the Spirit which they have received can be regarded only as a Spirit of adoption; but a spirit of bondage would be really a perverse spirit. [It should be remarked, that all views which give πνεῦμα a subjective meaning, must either take it in the first case as = disposition, and, in the second, = the human spirit as influenced by the Holy Spirit, thus having no exact correspondence; or, assume a hypothetical antithesis in the first case. It may be added, that it is difficult to account for the use of the word "receive" (especially the definite aorist), if these views be accepted, since the *servile spirit* was the natural spirit. We are thus driven to the interpretation, that πνεῦμα means the same spirit in both cases, defined first negatively, then positively. The probability of a reference to the Holy Spirit is very great in that case.—R.]

But yet the Apostle intimates that Judaism has made of the Old Testament a spirit (a spirit-like, complete system) of bondage, and that it might attempt to make such *a perverse spirit* of the New Testament. This intimation is brought out prominently by the πάλιν εἰς φόβον, which denotes a fact. At Sinai the Jews made of the law a law εἰς φόβον in the bad sense (Exod. xx. 19, &c.). On the other hand, the repetition of the ἐλάβετε favors the view given above: ye have not received a spirit of bondage, because that would be a contradiction.

Again to fear. This denotes the bound: wicked fear of slavish legalism. [De Wette, Meyer, Philippi, join πάλιν with εἰς φόβον as = *in order again to fear.* The πάλιν may imply that the condition under Judaism was one of fear, but it does not follow that the Roman Christians were mainly Jewish (Philippi), for this fear is a result of all unchristian religiousness. The πάλιν points to their previous condition in all cases.—R.]

But ye received the Spirit of adoption [ἀλλὰ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας. Meyer finds in the repetition of ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα something solemn. The force of the genitive must be determined largely by the meaning of πνεῦμα. Meyer: A spirit which is the ruling principle in the condition of adoption. Philippi, arguing, from Gal. iv. 5, 6, that adoption precedes the impartation of the Holy Spirit, finds another reason for the subjective sense of spirit; but the *adoption* may be taken, not as the act, but the state, which is more accordant with the context, since ἐν ᾧ, *wherein*, refers to a state or element of life. Out of this comes the subjective feeling, the cry, *Abba, Father.* The genitive then points to an effect as in *bondage*, which also has a descriptive clause appended.—R.]

De Wette: "υἱοθεσία, strictly, adoption instead of a child;" which meaning can be so urged, that they who were by nature the children of wrath (Eph. ii. 3), have been adopted, or appointed (Eph. i. 15), the children of God (Fritzsche, Meyer, and Olshausen). The same commentator says: "But it is a question whether—as even in the Old Testament (Deut. xxxii. 6), and in the New Testament (John i. 12; 1 John iii. 9; 2 Peter i. 4), and also in Paul, agreeably to the new creation (Gal. vi. 15), the idea of transformation into children of God occurs—there is not, consequently, in υἱοθ. rather the idea of sonship, of the real relation of children to the father (Luther, Usteri, &c.), than of adoption (Fritzsche, Meyer, and Tholuck). The expression, πνεῦμα υἱοθ., and the use made of the word in ver. 23, harmonizes better with this view." Tholuck, on the contrary, appeals to Eph. v. 1; Rom. ix. 4; to the designation of the adopted child by υἱὸς θετός (υἱὸς εἰσποίητος); and to the *adoptio filiorum* of the Vulgate. But Chrysostom, Theodoret, and other Greek expositors, on the other hand, have taken the word also in the sense of υἱότης. It is easy to see that the Apostle chose the expression in order to distinguish the children of faith, as adopted through grace, from the υἱὸς ἴδιος. But he had the further reason of not wishing to press the idea: for then he could not have said, with reference to the Hebrew law of inheritance, "And if children, then heirs." Likewise, the new birth by Christ and His Spirit denotes real υἱοί. [The actual sonship has already been mentioned in ver. 14. It seems more natural, then, to take this expression in the confirmatory verse in its literal sense, *adoption*, as implying the method of their becoming sons; the more so, as an appeal is made to the experience of the readers,

which experience would revert to the time when they passed out of one state into the other.—R.]

Wherein we cry (1 Cor. ii. 3) [ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν. The E. V., *whereby*, is not exact. Hodge: "which enables us to address God as our Father." Such an instrumental sense of the preposition is very doubtful. The first person is here used, probably from the deep feeling of fellowship which the thought awakens.—R.] The ἐν here designates the Spirit as the principle [element] of life, which has the full παῤῥησία as its result (Heb. x. 19–23). Κράζειν, *loud praying;* the voluntary, childlike exclamation. "Chrysostom raises the doubt, that, even in the Old Testament, God is called the Father of Israel; and he replies to it, by saying that the Jews did not use this term in their prayers; or, if they did, it was only ἐξ οἰκείας διανοίας, and not ἀπὸ πνευματικῆς ἐνεργείας κινούμενοι. Yet God certainly has the name of Father in the Old Testament, only in the same incomplete sense as the people the name of son—namely, as founder and protector of the people (Jer. iii. 4, 19, and elsewhere), and always in reference to the community, and not to the relation of the individual;" Tholuck. In the Apocrypha, He is first addressed thus by individuals (Book of Wisdom xiv. 3; Sirach xxiii. 1; li. 14). But we must not overlook the fact that, even in the Old Testament, the centre of the filial relation is the Messiah (2 Sam. vii.; Ps. ii.; Isa. ix.); and that, consequently, from the perfect New Testament centre of the relation of the Father to Christ, all υἱοθεσία extends.

Abba, Father. Ἀββᾶ [אַבָּא], the Syriac name for father (Gal. iv. 6; Mark xiv. 36). Why is the πατήρ added? Explanations:

1. The usual view (Rückert, Reiche, Köllner, &c.) is, the πατήρ helps to explain the Syriac *Abba*. So Hodge: "Paul chose to call God his Father, in his own familiar tongue. Having used the one word, however, the Greek, of course, became necessary for those to whom he was writing." But Paul does not always deem it necessary thus to translate (comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 22); and in the three cases where this phrase occurs, the usual mark of interpretation τοῦτ᾽ ἔστι) is wanting.—R.]

2. The repetition of the name is an expression of childlike fondness (Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsvestia, and Grotius [Alford]).

3. An expression of God's fatherhood for *Jews* and *Gentiles* (Augustine, Anselm, Calvin, Estius, and others).

4. The name "Abba" has passed from Jewish into Christian prayer, and has received, through Christ himself, the consecration of a special sanctity. Therefore the Greek-speaking Christians retained the word as a proper noun, and added thereto the πατήρ as an appellative, so that the Abba, Father, remained in force; Meyer. [So De Wette, Philippi, Lightfoot; comp. Lange's *Comm. Galatians*, p. 98. —R.] This would be, in reality, a duplication arising from a misconception. Tholuck unites with Luther, in favor of Chrysostom's view. Luther: "It is the *calling to*, just as a young child lisps to its father in simple, childlike confidence." If it be necessary to refer to the passage in Mark, the πατήρ there undoubtedly serves as an explanation. It is without any admixture of misconception that a liturgical use (as Hallelujah, Hosanna, Amen) has been made of this passage, because, in the most significant manner, there is in one salutation an invocation of the Father of Christ and the Father of Christians, the Father of the believers of the Old Testament and the New, the Father of Jews and Gentiles, and thus of the Father of all believers in all nations.

Ver. 16. **The Spirit itself** [αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα. The parallel passage, Gal. iv. 6, is conclusive in favor of a reference to the Holy Spirit, even if the context did not demand it.—R.] *Αὐτό.* Not *the same* (Erasmus, Luther), but the Spirit itself (Vulgate: *ipse spiritus;* Beza: *ipse ille spiritus*). We cry in the spirit, and the Spirit itself beareth us witness.

Beareth witness with [or to] **our spirit** [συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν]. It may be asked whether συμμαρτυρεῖ is to be taken in the sense of the strengthened, uncompounded word: He bears witness to our spirit, as the Vulgate, Luther, Grotius, Koppe, De Wette [Alford], and many other expositors hold; or, whether it should read: He bears witness with our self-consciousness: I am God's child. Meyer holds this opinion, insisting upon the συν here, as everywhere (chap. ii. 15; ix. 1). But the latter view would give rise to the question, To whom do both bear witness? And thus there would follow the conclusion: even self-consciousness bears witness to self-consciousness.* This view is hardly tenable. Chrysostom distinguishes as the two witnesses, the Holy Spirit and the grace given to us; and Hervæus, Calvin, Tholuck, and others, take the same position. Pareus even applies the legal maxim, "out of the mouth of two witnesses." "According to this old Protestant interpretation, the witness of our own spirit consists in the communication of the declaration of Divine pardon to the believing subject; but the witness of the Holy Spirit is regarded as a twofold one. On the one hand, it consists in the general witness by the Scriptures and the sacraments, and then in the *applicatio* and *obsignatio* produced by the Holy Spirit, while the declarations of the *obsignatio fidelium* are applied here."

Yet it seems clear from the antithesis, *the Holy Spirit* and *our spirit*, that the Holy Spirit should be regarded as the testifying part, but that our spirit, on the other hand, should be regarded as the part which is testified to. For the witness of our spirit has, as a special witness, no value beside that of the Holy Spirit (see Tholuck, p. 416, 417). And yet the question ever arises, To whom is the witness made? We hold that the expression συναντιλαμβάνεται (ver. 26) is an illustrative parallel, and must give importance to the consideration that there the explanatory word ὑπερεντυγχάνει is added. But we thereby approach nearer the explanation, that the συν in both cases has the meaning of a strengthened simple word. But it yet remains for us to conclude concerning a twofold function of the same Holy Spirit in the life of the soul. He operates in the filial life of the soul of believers as an impulse to

* [Dr. Lange does not seem to determine definitely in favor of either view. But his objection here is based on the assumption that our spirit is = self-consciousness. Is there not in Christians, during this time of witness-bearing, such a division still remaining, as to justify the interpretation which accepts a twofold witness? The witness is to the man as self-conscious, needing such testimony and borne both by the Holy Spirit, and the renewed nature, over against the remaining sinful nature. With our view of ver. 15, it is necessary that a new witness of this kind be introduced here. Philippi accepts the twofold witnessing here, claiming, however, that the other sense is possible only in case the reference in ver. 15 be to a filial spirit —R.]

prayer, but He also operates as the sealing witness of adoption. And thus He hastens in advance of our consciousness of faith with groanings which cannot be uttered (ver. 26). The συν, though it be not a mere simple prefix, does not always signify the equality of two different parts in one function. Sometimes it denotes the effect (συνάγω, συναθροίζω), and sometimes the conjoint conclusion of the act specified in the verb with a kindred fact (συνίημι). This is the case here.

It is important that the earlier theologians regarded this passage as a proof of the *certitudo gratiæ*, in opposition to the Catholic doctrine. Meyer very properly refers to the fact, that it is a witness against all pantheistic confusion of the Divine Spirit with that of man. It testifies to the living unity of both.* Melanchthon correctly observes against fanatics, that "the efficacy of the Spirit enters into the believer *prælucente voce evangelii*."

[That we are children of God, ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα θεοῦ. The purport of the testimony. Alford: "not υἱοί, because the testimony respects the very ground and central point of sonship, *likeness to and desire for God*."—R.] The word τέκνα emphasizes the heartiness of the filial feeling.

Ver. 17. **And if children, also heirs** [εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι]. We must supply ἐσμὲν both times. The *being heirs* arises from the very idea and right of a child (Gal. iv. 7).†

Heirs of God [κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ]. The inheritance is the kingdom of glory. God, as the eternally living One, is like the earthly testator, in that He gives His children every thing for an inheritance; but He gives them himself as the treasure of all treasures. He will be their inheritance, as they are to be His inheritance—a relation prefigured already in the Old Testament (Exod. xix. 5: Israel the peculiar treasure of God. Num. xviii. 20: Jehovah is the inheritance of the Levites, as they are His inheritance, *clerus*). As He himself will be all in all, so shall His children receive with Him, in His Son, every thing for an inheritance (1 Cor. iii. 21 ff.). In Luke xv. 12 the inheritance, in another sense, is spoken of. [Including in this the highest idea of eternal life, the declaration of the Apostle (ver. 13): *ye shall live*, is abundantly proven.—R.]

And joint-heirs with Christ [συνκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ]. Conformably to the υἱοθεσία, the υἱοί are in the most intimate fellowship with the υἱός, to which the common inheritance corresponds; Gal. iv. 7. The second designation characterizes the Divine inheritance of believers in its majesty, its infinite extent, and its nature, as the kingdom of perfect love in the glorified world. The view urged by Fritzsche, Meyer, and Tholuck, that here Paul does not have in mind the Hebrew, but the Roman right of inheritance (with reference to adopted children), Philippi correctly terms "an untheocratic reference to the Roman right of inheritance." ‡

If so be that we suffer with him [εἴπερ συνπάσχομεν. On the particle, see ver. 9. Here, as there, it implies a slight admonition, since it introduces a condition *sine quâ non*. The order, not the reason, of obtaining full salvation, is set forth (Calvin).—R.] Suffer with Christ—for Him, His gospel, His witness (1 Peter iv. 13; 2 Cor. v. 5; Phil. iii. 10; Col. i. 24;* 2 Tim. ii. 11). Suffering with Christ has the promise of being glorified with Him. Meyer says, strangely, that "Olshausen (comp. also Philippi) intermixes something totally wrong: 'Share in the conflict with sin in ourselves and in the world.'" Just this is the very nerve of the suffering with Christ.

[That we may be also glorified with him, ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν.] As Meyer properly says, against Tholuck, the ἵνα is not dependent on "joint-heirs," but on "suffer with Him." [This view is now given up by Tholuck, who correctly adds, however: "*That* does not describe the subjective, but the *objective*, *divine* design. (So Alford).—R.] On the relations of the right of inheritance in Rome, and other nations, see Tholuck, p. 419 [and the note on "joint-heirs"]. We must here hold to this much, at least, of the idea of adoption: that the joint-heirs with Christ become heirs of God through Christ, in and with Him as the truly Universal Heir.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The correct understanding of this eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans depends essentially on the following conditions: (1.) It must be regarded in connection with the whole section beginning with chap. v. 12; (2.) The antithesis in this chapter must be perceived. The fundamental thought is indicated in the superscriptions: Sin and the life of Christ, as opposite principles of life in the world. The foundation is given in chap. v. 12–21. The abrogation of the old principle in its two fundamental forms: Service of sin, service of the law; chap. vi. 1 to vii. 6. The transition from the old to the new nature; the inwardness of the law; chap. vii. 7–25. With chap. viii. there appears the new life of believers in Christ, and of Christ in believers. This new life itself constitutes again an antithesis. It is: *a.* An exclusively spiritual standpoint, in opposition to the flesh, and contemplates the extirpation of the old, sinful motions; *b.* A standpoint of renewal—whose object is the resurrection and the glorification of the world—proceeding from the Spirit, and embracing the flesh and the whole created world.

2. The Spirit of Christ's life being communicated to believers, it becomes to them a law of the Spirit for the new life. The law of the Spirit is a potency which extends further than the spirit of the law; much less is it a *nova lex* in the sense of the Catho-

* [On the witness of the Spirit, see *Doctr. Note* [13], and the works referred to in the list of Homiletical Literature on this section.—R.]

† [In Galatians, polemic necessity occasions a fuller and somewhat modified statement of this idea; see Lange's *Comm. in loco.*—R.]

‡ [The Jewish law gave a double portion to the eldest son; the Roman law made all children (adopted ones also) equal. (So the Attic law.) The point of this controversy about the reference to Jewish or Roman law of inheritance, is, that the former presents believers as heritors, sharing through the grace of Christ, the chief Heir, the latter, in in virtue of their sonship. Philippi calls the latter "profane, far-fetched, incongruous." Meyer and Tholuck think it appropriate in an Epistle to the Romans, and say that the only legal basis for the illustration is the Roman law. On the other hand, the genitive Χριστοῦ, where the dative might properly be used, may be urged in favor of the other view. In any case, the right of the adopted children is through the mediation of Christ. The context points to fellowship with him, so that heirship *in* him is an appropriate thought. Schmoller (*Galatians*, p. 98) deems the whole controversy pedantic.—R.]

* [In Col. i. 24, such sufferings are termed "the afflictions of Christ;" so intimate is the fellowship of Christ and his body, the Church. See also Heb. ii. 10.—R.]

lic dogmatics. Life in the *entire* spiritual view and experience of Christ's life constitutes a universal principle of life, which becomes the rule for every more general relation of life, and an ἐντολή of the living Divine will for every individual situation.

3. On ver. 3, see the *Exeg. Notes.* It is totally foreign to the context to give this passage a special application to the propitiation for the guilt of sin (for the discussions on the subject, see Tholuck). [Those who thus do, are careful to defend their position against antinomianism; but, practically, the danger from a too exclusive application of all possible passages to justification, lies in another direction, viz., that of legal efforts after holiness. The connection between pardon and holiness is thus obscured; the believer fails to see Christ as his life-giving Saviour; the law is again sought; "the spirit of bondage" returns, and the conflict of chap. vii. 14-25 is all too common. Whatever may be the logical and theological antithesis, the Christian pastor finds this to be the practical effect.—R.]—It is likewise a disregard of the definite expression to overlook the real meaning of the ὁμοίωμα. Because Christ appeared in the *truth* and *reality* of the σάρξ, He also appeared, according to the universal human view, in the *likeness* of sinful flesh. The Apostle expresses exactly the same thought in the words, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος; Phil. ii. 7. The reality of His human nature resulted in the likeness of His appearance and suffering life to the picture presented by the life of men. Baur's spiritualistically gross misconception of this declaration (Phil. ii.) makes a sort of Gnosticism out of it; the realistic obscuration of the term, on the other hand, allows Christ himself to have assumed sinful flesh. The simple thought is too grand for both these stunting and mutilating tendencies. God has unmasked and judged sin in the flesh, and condemned it to be cast out as a foreign element, a ruinous pseudo-plasma in the flesh, by Christ's assuming a pure and consecrated σάρξ, and by His keeping His white robe spotless on the whole filthy road of His pilgrimage, and maintaining its holiness until it was illuminated in glorified splendor. Thus the question, whether Christ assumed human nature in its paradisiacal state before the fall, or the fallen nature of Adam, is a thoroughly incorrect one, for it rests on a misconception of biblical facts. Christ assumed neither the unfallen nor the fallen human nature, but the nature raised from the fall and made holy. See the *Bible-Work* on John i. 14.

4. On the connection of the doctrine of the *obedientia activa* to ver. 3, see Tholuck, p. 395.

5. On ver. 4. The righteousness of Christ should be realized also in believers, from the principle of the righteousness of faith to the righteousness of life. See the *Exeg. Notes.*

6. The antithesis, walking in the flesh and walking in the Spirit, separates into these elements: *a.* Being or living in the flesh; being or living in the Spirit; *b.* The seeking of the flesh as enmity against God; the seeking of the Spirit as enlivened and impelled by the Spirit of God; *c.* The end—on one side, death; on the other, life and peace.

7. Those who live in the flesh cannot please God. Those imagine that they please God who, following the letter of the law, lead an analytically divided, ent, and fragmentary life, or a false life in outward observances. But God is one; His Spirit is one; His law, as the principle of life, is one; and salvation lies in the dynamical synthesis of life from a shedding abroad of the Spirit. See Mark xii 32 ff.

8. The real, fundamental thought of this section appears in ver. 10. See the *Exeg. Notes.* The body is dead by the necessarily positive standpoint of Christian life in the Spirit, and it is dead in its propensity to sin and death, in order that it may be raised from its state to a new life, and inherit the resurrection (1 Cor. ix. 27; 2 Cor. iv. 14; Eph. ii 5; Col. ii. 12; Phil. iii. 11). Also John vi., and the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, belong here. The effecting of the future resurrection by the renewal of the inner life, is questioned by Meyer, against De Wette and Philippi, for he does not place a correct estimate on the real relations of the kingdom of God (p. 246). On pneumatic corporeity, see Tholuck, pp. 485, 486.

9. On ver. 13. By the Spirit, and not by the scourge [*mit dem Geist, nicht mit der Geissel*], should the deeds of the body be mortified. See the *Exeg. Notes.*

10. On the difference between the symbolical and real children of God, see the *Exeg. Notes* on ver 14. On υἱοὶ θεοῦ, see Tholuck, p. 409.—That the υἱοθεσία, in the Apostle's sense, can be adoption only in form and mode, and not in its essence and substance, arises from the fact that believers, as the children of God, have the Spirit of God and of Christ; that they pray in filial confidence; and that they are destined to be heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ. [In interpreting the phrase, "sons of God," two errors must be guarded against: (*a.*) limiting it to something like this: the objects of God's favor; (*b.*) extending it so as to obliterate any real distinction between *the Son* and the adopted children. The latter may occur, either through a denial of the specific and eternal Sonship of Christ, or through some too spiritualistic view of the work of Redemption, which makes the children of God *in essence and substance* children. Pantheistic fancies follow the same tendency. Between these two lies the true definition. A Christian, as a son of God, is new-born of the Spirit of God; hence, has a likeness to God in character, is the object of God's special love, and entitled to special privilege and dignity. Yet even this is not all. The term is not merely figurative, as this passage shows, save as all language about our relations to God is figurative. The relation is *real*—grounded on, yet differing from, the relation of the Eternal Son. Only those in Him are "sons." They are "sons" in such a sense as to become partakers of the Divine nature (1 Peter i. 23). A further definition is now impossible. "Now are we sons of God; but it doth not yet appear what we shall be" (1 John iii. 3). The fact remains established; the manifestation of its full significance is to come; ver. 19.—R.]

11. The dogmatic spirit of the Middle Ages made of Christianity a religion πάλιν εἰς φόβον. Rome in particular did this, in spite of these words to the Romans, in ver. 15. Even the Old Testament and its law aimed at a higher fear of God, as the beginning of wisdom. See Ps. i. and Ps. xix. on communion with the law of God.

12. On the υἱοθεσία, and its origin in the Old Testament, see the *Exeg. Notes.*

13. In relation to adoption, the Spirit is our *witness;* in relation to future glory, it is our *pledge.* [*On the witness of the Spirit.* This consists in the gracious fruits and effects wrought in us by the Holy Spirit. "His whole inward and outward efficacy

must be taken together; for instance, His comfort, His incitement to prayer, His censure of sin, His impulse to works of love, to witness before the world," &c. (Olshausen). Yet filial feelings of those happy moments when we are conscious that we live by the Spirit, love God and goodness, desire and delight in pleasing God, must not be excluded; since, whether the witness be *to* or *with* our spirits, such results may be expected. Because enthusiasm has pushed this matter to an extreme at times, the assurance of salvation is not to be deemed unattainable, nor filial emotions toward God checked by the sneer about fanaticism. "That the world deny any such testimony in the hearts of believers, and that they look on it with scorn and treat it with derision, proves only that they are unacquainted with it; not that it is an illusion. It was a sensible and true remark of the French philosopher Hemsterhuys, in regard to certain sensations which he was discussing: 'Those who are so unhappy as never to have had such sensations, either through weakness of the natural organ, or because they have never cultivated them, will not comprehend me'" (Stuart).—R.] The conclusion, "and if children, then heirs," connects this section with the following.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Why do we, as those who are in Christ Jesus, have no more fear of condemnation? 1. Because the law of the Spirit of Christ has made us free from the law (that is, the power) of sin and death; 2. This has been effected by the act of God in condemning sin in the flesh.—Contrast between the law of the Spirit of Christ and the law of sin: 1. The former brings life; 2. The latter, death (ver. 2).—The appearance of the Son of God in the form (likeness) of sinful flesh: 1. In its meaning; 2. In its effects (vers. 3, 4).—The sending of God's Son an *act* of God (ver. 3).—He who becomes united with Christ ever more fully performs the righteousness required by the law (ver. 4).—Why is carnal-mindedness death? Because: 1. It is enmity against God; and, 2. As such, it is disobedience to God's law (vers. 5–7).—All who have Christ's Spirit are not carnal, but spiritual. This is shown thus: 1. Christ's Spirit reigns in their spirit; and therefore, 2. Their spirit reigns in their body (vers. 9–11).—"If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." This declaration is: 1. Perfectly true; but, 2. Fearful in its truth (ver. 9).—A question of conscience in two forms: 1. Have we Christ's Spirit? 2. Are we His? (ver. 9.)—The Spirit of God as pledge of our resurrection from the dead (ver. 11.)—The preparation of our bodies for the day of resurrection by the Spirit of God (ver. 11).—The glorification of physical life by God's Spirit (ver. 11).—The opposition between carnal and spiritual-mindedness one of death and life: 1. Demonstration (vers. 5–8); 2. Reference to the members of the Christian communion (vers. 9–11); 3. Inference for their moral life (vers. 11–13).—If we allow ourselves to be led by the Spirit of God, we are God's children, heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ. Reasons: 1. Because this spirit is not slavish, but filial; 2. Because He bears witness with us that we are children of God; 3. Because we are assured by Him of eternal glory (vers. 14–17).—The leading power of the Spirit of God (ver. 14).—The difference between Divine adoption in the Old Testament and the New (ver. 15).—The Spirit of God a spirit of prayer (ver. 15).—The Abba-Father cry of believing Christian souls: 1. So filially humble; 2. So filially joyous (ver. 15).—The inward witness of the Spirit: 1. Who bears this witness? 2. To whom is it borne? 3. What is its import? (ver. 16.)—How rich the children of God are! They are: 1. Heirs of God; 2. Joint-heirs with Christ (ver. 17).—Let us suffer with Christ, in order that we may be raised to glory with Him.

LUTHER: Although sin still rages in the flesh, we are not condemned, if the spirit is righteous, and fights against it. But where there is not this spirit, the law is weakened and overpowered by the flesh; so that it is impossible for the law to help man, except to sin and death. Therefore God sent His own Son, and placed upon Him our sins, and thus helped us to fulfil the law by His Spirit (vers. 1–4).

STARKE: Sin and death are connected together; who will separate them? Therefore, if you would escape death, you must flee from sin; James i. 15; Sirach xxi. 2, 3 (ver. 2).—Is sin sweet to thee, O man? Then remember that its fruit will be bitter (ver. 2).—HEDINGER: It is a false trust, to wish to be righteous in Christ, and, at the same time, to desire to walk after the flesh. Where sin reigns, there is condemnation, though Christ had died a thousand times. The flesh must die on the cross with Him, and His Spirit must live in the sinner; otherwise the salvation purchased by Christ will be of no use; 1 Peter ii. 24 (ver. 1).—STARKE: Adam (merely) out of us does not injure us; and Christ (merely) out of us does not help us (ver. 10).—People of the world seek immortality in wrong ways. Seek the right way, which is, to let God's Spirit dwell in you; Isa. lv. 2 (ver. 11).—It is better that we kill sin, than that sin kill us (ver. 13).—*Nihil vilius, quam a carne vinci, nihil gloriosius, quam carnem vincere;* JEROME.—*Qui sequuntur carnem, flagellantur in carne: in ipsa est censura supplicii, in qua fuit causa peccati;* BERNARD (ver. 12).—STARKE: One may speak of God without the Holy Spirit; but he cannot speak to Him in a way that the prayer will be granted (ver. 15).—If little children can move their parents' hearts by "papa" and "mamma," so can believers move God by the word "Abba" (ver. 15)—HEDINGER: To suffer, and to inherit, stand together. Very well! Heaven is worth a toilsome pathway. *Si vis regnare mecum, porta crucem meam tecum;* GERSON.

SPENER: God sent His Son to assume flesh; for the Word became flesh, not merely outwardly, but truly and in very deed. But such flesh in Him was not sinful; but it was only in the *form* of, or uniformity with, sinful flesh, so that he who saw it only outwardly might regard it just as sinful flesh as ours (vers. 3, 4.)—Christianity enjoins not only that we *do* good, and thus perform spiritual works, but that we should also be spiritually, and not carnally, *minded* (ver. 5).—The witness of the Holy Spirit is as glorious as it is necessary. . . This witness is the foundation of the highest consolation of the child of God. *Yet but little can be told of it, for no man can understand it except him who feels it.* It is "a new name," which nobody knows except him who receives it; Rev. ii. 17 (ver. 16). It is a great dignity, indeed, to be heirs of God, and to stand with Christ as though in the possession of equal rights. For it is the inheritance of the Almighty God, and therefore consists of eternal possessions. Yet such an inheritance has the certain

condition of having previously suffered with Christ (ver. 17).

Roos: Being in Christ Jesus presupposes longing for Christ Jesus; fleeing to Him; submission to Him; being planted in Him as the Vine; union with Him; and, consequently, faith in Him; just as even the continued being, or remaining, in Christ Jesus, rests upon a continuous faith in Him (vers. 1-4).—The man who is in Christ Jesus does not walk any more after the flesh; and thus the righteousness, or righteous requirement, of the law, which is spiritual, is fulfilled in him; it is so far fulfilled as his spiritual life and walk in the Spirit extend (ver. 4).—In short, just as the Spirit comprises spiritual-mindedness, and walking after the Spirit comprises every thing which is good, praiseworthy, holy, and well-pleasing to God; so do the words flesh, carnal-mindedness, and walking after the flesh, comprise every thing wicked and sinful (vers. 6-8).—Suffering does not precede glory by mere accident; it does so by God's design, and makes fit for great glory. It is only a nature crushed by suffering that can be glorified. But the suffering must be: 1. A suffering with Christ; 2. In fellowship with Christ; 3. In the likeness of the suffering and mind of Christ. Then will we be also raised to glory with Christ, in whom we are by faith (ver. 17).—Bengel: The carnal mind cannot, and *may* not. Hence comes the pretext of impossibility with which those seek to excuse themselves who are even here convicted as carnal (ver. 7).

Gerlach: What seems remote and difficult to man under the law, is made easy by grace; indeed, is even accomplished by grace (vers. 2, 3).—Both flesh and spirit are mighty and active forces in man (ver. 5).—"The Spirit should be as much the Lord of our life, as the helmsman is guide of the ship, and the driver is guide of his team;" Chrysostom (ver. 14).—The Spirit of adoption is the Spirit of the Son of God. In Him we cry, Abba, dear Father! He encourages us to call, with childlike joy and confidence, upon God, whom Christ thus called on (Mark xiv. 26); and whom Christ, after the atonement was completed (John xx. 17), calls His God and ours, His Father and ours (ver. 15).—The witness of the Spirit of God consists in the consciousness of peace with God, and of access to Him in childlike, believing prayer; which witness we have received through faith in Christ (ver. 16).—The believer enters upon the inheritance of God as "joint-heir with Christ;" but it is not a dividing joint-heirship, by which one receives what another is deprived of. It is a possession like that of the sunlight, which every one enjoys to the full, without any robbery of another (ver. 17).—The life of the Christian is really a life of suffering, both inwardly and outwardly, except that the consciousness of Divine adoption rises high above suffering and oppression (ver. 17).

Lisco: The certainty of the attainment of perfect salvation by believers, rests upon their fellowship with Christ, and upon their being and living in Him; and it is from this true fountain that their ever-progressive sanctification flows (ver. 1).—What prospects, what hopes! Yet the *order* is, that we, like Christ, shall attain future glory through suffering.—Luther: "He who would be Christ's brother and joint-heir, must bear in mind to be also a joint-martyr and joint-sufferer; not feeling Christ's sufferings and shame after Him, but with Him, as vers. 10, 32, 33, declare" (ver. 17).

Heubner: The guiltlessness of true Christians (ver. 2).—We must preach duties so conformably to the gospel, that they will be a pleasure (ver. 3).—Faith in Christ gives no aid to indolence. The design of the atonement is our sanctification (ver. 4).—The carnal mind and religion do not agree together (ver. 7).—Christ's Spirit is the true Spirit: men out of Him are *spiritless*, however *full of the Spirit* such unchristian people may fancy themselves (ver. 9).—Life after the flesh destroys all Christian prosperity, spiritual enjoyment, vital force, and eternal salvation (ver. 13).—The Spirit *can* overpower the flesh; therefore no Christian can say, that the power of the flesh is too great, too insurmountable (ver. 13).—The guidance of the Spirit of God is: 1. Not irregular, but regular, and its traces are to be found rather within than without; 2. Nor a sudden impulse, an emotion; but a continuous guidance, extending through the whole life, and operating in all acts; 3. And finally, this guidance is effected by means of the Word; it is free, and without compulsion (ver. 14).—The Abba-cry is an uninterrupted thinking upon God, and longing after Him.—No cross, no crown.—Besser: The impulsive power of the Holy Spirit is twofold: He leads us to receive in faith, and give in love.—The glorification of Christians begins with Christ under the cross.

The Pericope (vers. 12-17) *for the 8th Sunday after Trinity.*—Heubner: The adoption of Christians with God: 1. It is holy; 2. It is saving.—The difference between the children of the world and the children of God.—Genzler: Those whom the Spirit of God leads, are God's children. The Apostle praises: 1. The filial mind; 2. The filial joyfulness; and, 3. The filial hope of those who allow themselves to be led by the Spirit of God.—Petri: The children of God: 1. Their nature; 2. condition; 3. and inheritance.—Harless: The poverty and wealth of the legacy of Jesus Christ.—Tholuck: The witness of Divine adoption is the surest pledge of eternal life. 1. In what is the witness of Divine adoption manifested? 2. Why is it a pledge of eternal life?—Kapff: The healing of sinful corruption by Jesus and His Spirit. Through Him we become: 1. Children of God; 2. Praying men of the Spirit; and, 3. Joint-heirs with Christ.

[Burkitt (condensed): All men show the true temper of their minds, and the complexion and disposition of their souls, by willingly, cheerfully, and constantly minding either the things of the Spirit or the things of the flesh.—Three things are implied in our being glorified with Christ: 1. Conformity—we shall be like Him in glory; 2. Concomitancy—we shall accompany Him, and be present with Him in glory; 3. Conveyance or derivation—His glory shall be reflected upon us, and we shall shine in His beams.—Henry: It was great condescension, that He who was God should be made in the likeness of *flesh*; but much greater, that He who was *holy* should be made in the likeness of *sinful* flesh.—The Spirit witnesses the privileges of children to none who have not the nature and privileges of children.—Doddridge: The Spirit of God will not dwell with those whom He does not effectually govern.—Macknight: The minding of the things of the flesh, to the neglecting of the things of the Spirit, disqualifying men for heaven, stands in direct opposition to God's friendly intentions; consequently, is enmity against God, and is deservedly punished with death.—Wesley (sermons on the *Witness of the Spirit*): The witness of the Spirit is a consciousness of our having received, in and by the Spirit of adoption

the tempers mentioned in the Word of God as belonging to His adopted children—a loving heart toward God, and toward all mankind; hanging with childlike confidence on God our Father; desiring nothing but Him; casting all our care upon Him; and embracing every child of man with earnest, tender affection, so as to be ready to lay down our life for our brother, as Christ laid down His life for us. It is a consciousness that we are inwardly conformed, by the Spirit of God, to the image of His Son, and that we walk before Him in justice, mercy, and truth, doing the things which are pleasing in His sight.—CLARKE: Ver. 15. The witness of the Spirit is the grand and most observable case in which intercourse is kept up between heaven and earth; and the genuine believer in Christ Jesus is not left to the quibbles or casuistry of polemic divines or critics, but receives the *thing* and the *testimony* of it from God himself. Remove the testimony of adoption from Christianity, and it is a dead letter.—HODGE: There can be no rational or scriptural hope without holiness; and every tendency to separate the evidence of the Divine favor from the evidence of true piety, is antichristian and destructive.—BARNES: If a man is not influenced by the meek, pure, and holy spirit of the Lord Jesus; if he is not conformed to His image; if his life does not resemble that of the Saviour, he is a stranger to religion. No test could be more easily applied, and none is more decisive.

[HOMILETICAL LITERATURE ON THE 8TH CHAPTER OF ROMANS: BISHOP COWPER, *Heaven Opened, &c.*, 5th ed., Lond., 1619; E. PHILIPS, *Nineteen Sermons;* E. ELTON, *The Triumph of a True Christian Described, or, An Explanation of the 8th Chapter of Romans*, 1623; H. BINNING, *The Sinner's Sanctuary; being 48 Sermons on the 8th Chapter of Romans;* T. JACOMB, *Several Sermons on the whole 8th Chapter of Romans*, London, 1672; T. HORTON, *Forty-six Sermons on the whole 8th Chapter of Romans*, London, 1674; T. MANTON, Forty-seven sermons in *Works* (vol. 2); MESTREZAT, *Sermons sur la 8e chap. de l'Epitre aux Romains*, Amsterdam, 1702; T. BRYSON, *Comprehensive View of the Real Christian's Character, &c.*, London, 1794; BISHOP SHORT, *The Witness of the Spirit with our Spirit, Illustrated from the 8th Chapter of Romans* (Bampton Lectures), Oxford, 1846; WINSLOW, *No Condemnation in Christ Jesus, as Unfolded in the 8th Chapter of Romans*, London, 1857.—J. F. H.]

II. Life in the Spirit in connection with nature as the Resurrection-life, and the Spirit as security of glory.

CHAPTER VIII. 18–39.

A. The present and subjective certainty of future glory, or the glorification of the body and of nature by the Spirit (vers. 18–27).

18 For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time *are* not worthy *to be*
compared [insignificant *in comparison*] with the glory which shall be revealed
19 in us [εἰς ἡμᾶς].[1] For the earnest [patient] expectation of the creature [crea-
tion][2] waiteth [is waiting] for the manifestation [revelation] of the sons of God.
20 For the creature [creation] was made subject[3] to vanity, not willingly, but by
reason of him who hath subjected *the same* [who subjected *it*,][4] in hope; [,][5]
21 Because [That] the creature [creation] itself also shall be delivered from the
bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty [freedom of the glory] of the
22 children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth [together]
23 and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only *they* [*so*],[6] but [but
even we] ourselves also [*omit* also], which [though we] have the firstfruits of the
Spirit, even we ourselves[7] groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption,[8]
24 *to wit*, [*omit to wit*,] the redemption of our body. For we are [were] saved by
[in][9] hope: but [now] hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth,
25 why doth he yet [still][10] hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, *then*
26 do we with patience wait for *it* [with patience we wait for it]. Likewise the
Spirit also helpeth our infirmities [weakness]:[11] for we know not what we
should pray for[12] as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession [inter
27 cedeth] for us [*omit* for us][13] with groanings which cannot be uttered. And
[But] he that [who] searcheth the hearts knoweth what *is* the mind of the
Spirit, because he maketh intercession [pleadeth] for the saints according to *the*
will of God.

B. The future and objective certainty of glory (vers. 28–37).

28 And we know that all things[14] work together for good to them that [those
who] love God, to them [those] who are the called according to *his* purpose.
29 For whom he did foreknow [foreknew], he also did predestinate [predestinated]

to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among
30 many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate [predestinated], them he
also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified
31 them he also glorified. What shall we then [What then shall we] say to these
32 things? If God *be* [*is*] for us, who *can be* [*is*] against us? He that [Who]
spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with
33 him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay any thing to the charge of
34 God's elect? *It is* God that justifieth. [!] [15] Who *is* he that condemneth?
It is Christ [*or*, Christ *is* Jesus] [16] that died, yea rather, [17] that is risen again,
who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.
35 Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? *shall* tribulation, or distress,
36 or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written,
For thy sake we are killed all the day long;
We are [were] accounted as sheep for the slaughter.
37 Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that [who]
loved [18] us.

D. The unity of the subjective and objective certainty of future glory in the already attained glorious life of love, the Spirit of glory (vers. 38, 39).

38 For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities,
nor powers, [*omit* nor powers,] [19] nor things present, nor things to come, [*insert* nor
39 powers,] Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature [created thing], [20] shall
be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 18.—[It is difficult to render εἰς ἡμᾶς literally. *In us* (E. V.) implies that we are the subjects of the revelation, and this is the main thought. Alford renders: *with regard to us*; Lange: *auf und an uns.*

[2] Ver. 19.—[Κτίσις occurs four times in vers. 19–22, with the same meaning. In ver. 22 it is best to render it *creation*, and in the other cases it should conform. Lange: *die Kreatürliche Welt*, *Kreatur-Welt*. On the various limitations of meaning, see *Exeg. Notes*.

[3] Ver. 20.—[Lange renders ὑποτάγη, *unterwarf sich*, adopting the middle sense; but as this sense is doubtful, the English text has not been altered.

[4] Ver. 20.—[*In hope* is not to be joined with what immediately precedes, hence a comma must be inserted. Griesbach and Knapp make οὐκ . . . ὑποτάξαντα parenthetical, but without sufficient reason. Amer. Bible Union also makes a parenthetical clause: but by reason of him who made it subject; yet this only seems to add confusion. See the next note.

[5] Ver. 20.—[Lange puts a full stop after *hope*. Meyer, and many others, a comma, connecting the next verse: that the creation, &c. (the purport of the hope). Forbes gives the parallelism thus:

19. a. Ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως
b. τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται,
20. τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑποτάγη,
οὐχ ἑκοῦσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα,
21. *a.* ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς
b. εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ.

19. a. For the earnest expectation of the creation
b. Is waiting for the revelation of the sons of God,
20. For the creation was made subject to vanity,
Not willingly, but by reason of Him who subjected it,
21. *a.* In hope, that the creature itself shall also be delivered from the bondage of corruption,
b. Into the liberty of the glory of the children of God.

This makes the whole of ver. 20, except *in hope*, parenthetical, and connects ver. 21 with that phrase, as giving the purport of the hope. On this last view, Forbes does not insist, however. *In hope* is thus made to refer to both lines of the parenthesis, yet with a main reference to ἀπεκδέχεται, *is waiting*. The two lines of ver. 19 find their parallels in ver. 21, while a. *a.* refer to the *expectation* or *hope* that animates creation; b. *b.* to the final consummation to which it points. At the beginning of ver. 21, Lange reads *denn*, Alford, *because*, but Tholuck, Philippi, Meyer, Amer. Bible Union, Noyes, five Anglican clergymen, &c., favor *that*, introducing the purport of the hope.

[6] Ver. 23.—[*So*, or *this* should be supplied; the meaning is: *Not only is this so.* The E. V. is therefore inexact. The latest revisions adopt *so.*

[7] Ver. 23.—[There is considerable variation in the text here, not affecting the sense, however. B. reads καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες καὶ αὐτοί; adopted by Tischendorf, Meyer, Lange, Tregelles. The *Rec.* inserts ἡμεῖς *after* the second καί; ℵ. A. C., Lachmann, Alford *before* it, so Tregelles, in brackets; while D. F. G., Fritzsche insert the same after the *first* καί. The original reading was probably that of B.; ἡμεῖς being inserted as an explanatory gloss, hence the variation in position (Meyer). As καὶ αὐτοί is repeated, it is better to render *even we ourselves* in both cases.

[8] Ver. 23.—[D. F. G. omit υἱοθεσίαν, which is strongly attested, however. The omission may have arisen from the thought that the word meant something already possessed, and hence was inappropriate here.

[9] Ver. 24.—[The dative. τῇ ἐλπίδι, is not instrumental. *Now* is the better rendering of the logical δέ, which follows.

[10] Ver. 24.—[ℵ. A. C. K. L., read τί καί (*Rec.*, Meyer, Wordsworth, Lange); B. D. F. omit καί (Lachmann, Alford, Tregelles). The latter reading gives the sense: *Why doth he hope* (*at all*)? the former, which is preferable *Why doth he still hope for?* καί = *etiam.*

[11] Ver. 26.—[Instead of ταῖς ἀσθενείαις (*Rec.*, K. L.), which was probably a marginal gloss, ℵ. A. B. C. D. most cursives, versions, and fathers, read τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ; adopted by most editors.

[12] Ver. 26.—[ℵ. A. B. C., Lachmann, Alford, Wordsworth, Tregelles, read προσευξώμεθα (aorist); D. K. L. Griesbach, Tischendorf, προσευξόμεθα. Both are grammatical, either may have been original; but the former is slightly better attested.

[13] Ver. 26.—[Ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (*Rec.* ℵ[3]. C. K. L.) is omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth, Lange, Tregelles, on the authority of ℵ[1]. A. B. D. F. G. Probably added for closer definition.

[14] Ver. 28.—[ℵ. A. B. insert ὁ θεός (as subject) after συνεργεῖ. It is omitted in C. D. F. K. L., and rejected by most editors. The seeming necessity of some such subject led to its insertion, which was rendered easier by the presence of θεόν (immediately before). Lachmann, who retains it, inserts τὸ before ἀγαθόν, on insufficient authority.

[15] Ver. 33.—[In vers. 33–35, Lange adopts the punctuation followed in the E. V., except in this trifling particular. Very many, however, place an interrogation point after each clause. (See Alford, who incorrectly quotes Meyer as favoring this view.) Tischendorf and Meyer place a *colon* after δικαιῶν, and also after ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (ver. 34). Tregelles a comma after the former, a colon after the latter. The relation of the clauses, which involves the punctuation, is discussed in the *Exeg. Notes*.

[16] Ver. 34.—[After Χριστός, ℵ. A. C. F. L. insert Ἰησοῦς (adopted by Lange). It is omitted in B. D. K., by Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Tregelles, and most editors. Hence the rendering of Lange (bracketted in the text) is doubly doubtful: first, on account of the dubious reading; second, as a somewhat forced exegesis. See *Exeg. Notes*.

[17] Ver. 34.—[Μᾶλλον δὲ καί (*Rec.*) is supported by D. F. K. L.; καί is omitted in ℵ. A. B. C. (by Lachmann, Tregelles, bracketted by Alford), but, as Meyer suggests, was easily overlooked between ΔΕ and ΕΓ.

[18] Ver. 37.—[Instead of the well-supported τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος, D. E. F. G., and many Latin fathers, read: τὸν ἀγαπήσαντα; objectionable on both critical and exegetical grounds.

[19] Ver. 38.—[The order in ℵ. A. B. C. D. F. is οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα, οὔτε μέλλοντα, οὔτε δυνάμεις; adopted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Tregelles, and critical editors generally. The *Recepta* puts οὔτε δυνάμεις first (K. L., some versions). This may readily be accounted for; δύναμις is associated with ἄγγελοι or ἀρχή in Eph. i. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 24; 1 Peter iii. 22, hence the seeming necessity for a closer connection here. In Col. ii. 15, δυνάμεις is omitted, but in all the passages cited, ἐξουσία is found; hence we find it as a variation here, but very slightly attested.

[20] Ver. 39.—[Τὶς κτίσις cannot, of course, mean *creation* here.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary.—The witness of Divine adoption, imparted by the Holy Spirit to believers, comprises at the same time, according to ver. 17, the security that they will be heirs of future glory. Then, too, the physical body—which, in their spiritual life in this world, they mistrust, because of its enervation through sin, which they must strictly control by walking in the Spirit, but in which, even here, according to ver. 11, a germ of its glorification into the psychico-physical existence is formed—shall be transformed into the glory of the Spirit; and all nature, at present made partaker of corruption, yet groaning and travailing to be spiritualized, shall share in the glory also, as the transformed, illuminated, and appropriated organ of the kingdom of spirits. Ver. 17 serves as a foundation for the section which now follows, as it terminates the previous section as a final inference.

A. *The present and subjective certainty of future glory.*

Believers, from their present and subjective sense of life, are certain of future glory; accordingly, all the sufferings of the present time are to them as birth-pangs for future glory. This holds good, first, in respect to the pressure toward development, and the longing and patient waiting of nature in its present state; and this pressure toward development corresponds with that of God's kingdom. It holds good, secondly, in regard to the birth-pangs of God's kingdom, as manifested, first, in the groanings, longings, and hopes of believers, and in the unutterable groanings of the Spirit, who intercedes for them. Although believers have the Spirit of adoption, it is because they have it that they still groan for its consummation (2 Cor. v. 1). Their principial salvation is not their finished salvation; but the latter is testified by their hope and confirmed by their patience. But the Spirit proves himself in their hearts by unutterable groanings, as a vital pressure, which harmonizes in this life with the sense of the future exercise of God's authority, and points to the future objective certainty of glory as founded in the will of God; vers. 18 (17)–27.

B. *The future and objective certainty of glory.*

The love for God by believers is the experience of God's love for them. But therein lies the security of an omnipotent power for its completion—a power which nothing can oppose, but to which every thing must serve. The certainty of the decisive κλῆσις is the centre and climax of the life, from which the groundwork, as well as the future of life, is glorified. It points backward to God's purpose, and forward to its consummation. The periods between the pre-temporal, eternal purpose of God, and its future, eternal consummation, are the periods of the order of salvation (ver. 29). That this way of salvation leads through suffering to glory, according to the image of Christ's life, is secured by the omnipotent decision with which "God is for" (ver. 31) His children—a decision which is secured by the gift of Christ for them, by their justification, their reconciliation, redemption, and exaltation in Christ; in a word, by the love of Christ. This love leads them in triumph through all the temptations of the world, because it is the expression of Christ's own conquest of the world (vers. 28–37).

C. *The unity of the subjective and objective certainty of future glory in the glorious life of love already attained.*

Life in the love of Christ is exalted above all the powers of the world (vers. 38, 39).—Kindred sections: John xvii.; 1 Cor. xv., and others.

Tholuck: "This inheritance will far outweigh all suffering, and must be awaited with steadfast hope (vers. 18–27). But as far as we are concerned, we can suffer no more injury; the consciousness of God's love in Christ rests upon so impregnable a foundation, that nothing in the whole universe can separate 'him' from it" (vers. 28–39).—Meyer finds, in vers. 18–31, "grounds of encouragement for the συμπάσχειν, ἵνα κ. συνδοξ. To wit: 1. The future glory will far outweigh the present suffering (vers. 18–25). 2. The Holy Spirit supports us (vers. 26, 27). 3. Every thing must work together for good to them that love God" (vers. 28–31). Undoubtedly these things are grounds of encouragement; yet the Apostle evidently designs to encourage by a copious and conclusive didactic exposition of the certainty of the Christian's hope of future glory, in face of the great apparent contradictions of this hope—an exposition which, in itself, has great value.

[Alford (vers. 18–30): "The Apostle treats of the complete and glorious triumph of God's elect, through sufferings and by hope, and the blessed renovation of all things in and by their glorification." (Vers. 31–39): "The Christian has no rea

son to fear, but all reason to hope; for nothing can separate him from God's love in Christ."—Hodge, making the theme of the chapter "the security of the believer," finds, in vers. 18–28, a proof of this "from the fact that they are sustained by hope, and aided by the Spirit, under all their trials; so that every thing eventually works together for their good." In vers. 29, 30, another proof "founded on the decree or purpose of God." In vers. 31–39, yet another, founded "on His infinite and unchanging love."—R.]

First Paragraph, vers. 18–27.

Ver. 18. **For I reckon,** &c. [λογίζομαι γάρ, κ.τ.λ. Γάρ connects this verse with ver. 17, introducing a reason why the present sufferings should not discourage (De Wette, Philippi). Calvin: *Neque vero molestum nobis debet, si ad cœlestem gloriam per varias afflictiones procedendum est, quandoquidem*, &c. Stuart prefers to join it to "glorified with Him;" "we shall be glorified with Christ, *for* all the sufferings and sorrows of the present state are only temporary." The connection seems to be with the whole thought which precedes. The verb is thus expanded by Alford: "I myself am one who have embraced this course, being convinced that." It is used as in chap. iii. 28; see p. 136.—R.] Now by his view of the magnitude of future glory, as well as by his conviction of its certainty, he estimates the proportionate insignificance of the sufferings (certainly great when considered in themselves alone) of the present time, since they, as birth-throes, are the preliminary conditions of future glory.

Insignificant, οὐκ ἄξια, not of weight; a stronger expression for ἀνάξια. They are not synonymous.* The νῦν καιρός is the final, decisive time of development, with which the αἰὼν οὗτος will terminate.

In comparison with the glory which shall be revealed [πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι. On πρός after οὐκ ἄξια, in the sense of *in relation to, in comparison with*, see Tholuck, Philippi *in loco*.—R.] Τὴν μέλλουσαν is antecedent, with emphasis. [To this Alford objects]. That glory is ever approaching, and therefore ever near at hand, though Paul does not regard its presence near in the sense of Meyer, and others. —**In us** [see *Textual Note* [1]]. The εἰς ἡμᾶς does not mean, as the Vulgate and Beza have it, *in nobis* [so E. V.]; it is connected with the ἀποκαλυφθῆναι. If it is imparted through the inward life of believers and through nature, it nevertheless comes from the future and from above, as much as from within outwardly, and it is a Divine secret from eternity in time—therefore ἀποκάλυψις.

Ver. 19. **For the patient expectation** [ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαραδοκία. On ἀποκαραδοκία, comp. Phil. i. 20. The verb καραδοκεῖν means, literally, *to expect with uplifted head;* then, *to expect*. The noun, strengthened by ἀπό, refers to an expectation, which is constant and persistent until the time arrives. The idea of anxiety (Luther) is not prominent. (So Tholuck, Philippi, De Wette, Meyer.) See below also. Tholuck remarks, that the strengthening of the attributive notion into a substantive makes a double prosopopœia, "not only the *creature*, but the *expectation of the creature* waits."—R.] The γάρ introduces the first proof of his statement from the course of the whole κτίσις. It may be asked, Shall the future glory be shown in its *grandeur* (Chrysostom [Hodge, Alford], and most expositors), its *certainty* (Fritzsche, Meyer), its *nearness* (Reiche), or its *futurity* (Philippi)? Tholuck, in its *grandeur* and *certainty*.* If both must combine in one idea, then it is the *truth* or the *reality* of the glory, as such. The elements of its grandeur, as of its certainty, are united in the fact that the developing pain of the external κτίσις, as of the inward life of believers—indeed, the groaning of the Divine spiritual life itself—labors for it and points toward it; that it will consist in the removal of all vanity and corruption in the whole natural sphere of mankind.

Of the creation, τῆς κτίσεως. The great question is, What is the κτίσις? *Lexically*, the word may mean the act of creation, as well as what is created, the creation; † but *actually*, the question here can only be the creation in the broader or more limited sense. Tholuck: "κτίσις in the passive sense can mean the same as κτίσμα, the single creature; ver. 39; Heb. iv. 13. Ἡ κτίσις, Book of Wisdom ii. 6; xvi. 24; Heb. ix. 11; or even ὅλη ἡ κτίσις, Book of Wisdom xix. 6; πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις, Judith xvi. 17, the created world. But in that case, as also with ὅλος ὁ κόσμος (John xii. 19), it is metonymically confined to the human world (Col. i. 23; Mark xvi. 15; and also with the Rabbis, כָּל בְּרִיאָה, &c.), or to irrational nature, exempting man."

The explanations are divided into different groups:

1. *The natural and spiritual world.* The universe. Origen: Man as subject to corruption; souls of the stars. Theodoret: also the angels. Theodore of Mopsvestia, Olshausen: The whole of the universe. Köllner, Koppe, Rosenmüller (*tota rerum universitas*).

2. *Inanimate creation.* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Calvin, Beza, Fritzsche: *mundi machina.*)

3. *Animate creation.* *a.* Humanity (Augustine, Turretine,‡ &c.; Baumgarten-Crusius: still unbelieving men); *b.* unconverted heathen (Locke, Lightfoot, and others). Rabbinical usage of language: the heathen: בְּרִיאָה; *c.* the Jewish people, because the Jews were called God's creation (Cramer, and others); *d.* the Gentile Christians, because the proselytes were called new creatures (Clericus, Nösselt); *e.* Jewish Christians (Gockel; for the same reason as under *c.*); *f.* Christians in general (καινὴ κτίσις, Socinians and Arminians).—Evidently there

* On the controversy between the Protestant and Catholic theologians in regard to the *meritum condigni*, as connected with this passage, see Tholuck, p. 421. [Comp. Philippi on both *meritum condigni* and *meritum congrui*. Also Calvin. As Dr. Hodge remarks, the idea of merit "is altogether foreign to the context."—R.]

* [The primary reference seems to be to its *greatness;* but a secondary reference to its certainty and futurity would necessarily be implied in "the patient expectation." —R.]

† [The English word *creation* has precisely the same twofold sense; but it always has a general reference when used in the passive sense. Κτίσις undoubtedly has a more special reference in many cases, but it would seem that the more general signification preceded the more special one, and hence that the limitation of meaning must always be derived from the context.—R.]

‡ [This is the view adopted and defended at some length by Professor Stuart in an Excursus on this verse. Notwithstanding his able argument, the interpretation is entirely too restricted to meet with general acceptance. An instinct of immortality is assumed, and pressed as the main thought. Comp. Hodge, in opposition to Stuart's view —R.]

is no reference, on one hand, to the mathematical or astronomical character of the heavenly bodies, nor, on the other, to the real rational or spiritual world, but to a creature-life, which can groan and earnestly expect.

4. Inanimate and animate nature, in contradistinction from humanity * (Irenæus, Grotius, Calovius, Neander, Meyer, De Wette) [Hodge, Alford].—[Schubert: "Even in the things of the bodily world about us there is a life-element which, like that statue of Memnon, unconsciously sounds in accord when touched by the ray from on high."—P. S.] But the distinction from mankind must be confined to the distinction from the spiritual life of renewed mankind; for sinful mankind is utterly dependent upon nature, and even believers have their natural side (2 Cor. v. 1 ff.). Nor can the universe, in its merely natural side, be altogether meant, since the Holy Scriptures distinguish a region of glory from the region of humanity in this life.

5. Tholuck: "*The material world surrounding man.*" The Scriptures very plainly distinguish between an earthly natural world related to mankind, and a region of glory. (See the ascension; 1 Cor. xv.; Heb. ix. 11, &c.) The former alone is subject to vanity, and hence it alone can be intended. But there is no ground for making divisions in reference to this human natural world. The Apostle assumes, rather, that this creature-sphere is in a state of collective, painful striving for development, which expresses itself as sensation only proportionately to the sensational power of life, and hence is more definitely expressed, appears more frequently, and reaches its climax in living creatures and in the natural longing which mankind feels (2 Cor. v. 1). The real personification of nature in man is the final ground for the poetical personification of nature.

[6. *The whole creation, rational as well as irrational, not yet redeemed, but needing and capable of redemption*, here opposed to the new creation in Christ and in the regenerate. The children of God appear, on the one side, as the first-fruits of the new creation, and the remaining creatures, on the other, as consciously or unconsciously longing after the same redemption and renewal. This explanation seems to be the most correct one. It most satisfactorily accounts for the expressions: *expectation*, *waiting*, *groaning*, *not willingly* (ver. 20), and *the whole creation* (ver. 22). The whole creation, then, looks forward to redemption; all natural birth, to the new birth. As all that is created proceeded from God, so it all, consciously or unconsciously, strives after Him as its final end. What shows itself in nature as a dim impulse, in the natural man, among the heathen, and yet more among the Jews, under the influence of the law, comes to distinct consciousness and manifests itself in that loud cry after deliverance (chap. vii. 24), which Christ alone can satisfy; and then voices itself in happy gratitude for the actual redemption. Olshausen aptly says: "Paul contrasts Christ, and the *new* creation called forth by Him, to all the *old* creation, together with the unregenerate men, as the flower of this creation. The whole of this old creation has one life in itself, and this is yearning for redemption from the bonds which hold it, and hinder its glorification; this one yearning has forms different only according to the different degrees of life, and is naturally purer and stronger in unregenerate men than in plants and animals; in them, the creation has, as it were, its mouth, by which it can give vent to its collective feeling. Yet the most of these men *know* not what the yearning and seeking in them properly mean; they understand not the language of the Spirit in them; nay, they suppress it often, though it is, meanwhile, audible in their heart; and what they do not understand themselves, God understands, who listens even to prayers not understood. But however decided the contrast between the old and new creation, yet they may not be considered as separated thoroughly. Rather, as the new man, in all distinctness from the old, still is *in* the old, so is the new creation (Christ, and the new life proceeding from Him) in the old world. The old creation, therefore, is like an impregnate mother (comp. ver. 23), that bears a new world in her womb—a life which is not herself, neither springs from her, but which, by the overmastering power that dwells in it, draws her life, with which it is connected, on and on into itself, and changes it into its nature, so that the birth (the completion of the new world) is the mother's death (the sinking of the old)."—P. S.]

[This last view seems to be that of Dr. Lange himself. It is ably defended by Forbes, pp. 310–330. The limitation to creation, as capable of redemption, implies that only so much of creation as is linked with the fall of man, and subject to the curse, should be included. Thus it differs from 1. Col. i. 20, however, gives a hint as to the extent of this connection with man. The context renders such a limitation necessary. On the other hand, it differs from 4, in including man in his fallen condition. The reasons for excluding humanity have been given above. It will appear that, against this view, they are of comparatively little weight. Certainly the burden of proof rests with those who adopt 4; for man is the head of the creation, to which they apply κτίσις; not merely as the final and crowning work of the repeated creative agency which brought it into being, but as the occasion of its present groaning condition. Besides, man, viewed on one side of his nature, is a part of this material and animal creation. It seems arbitrary to sunder him from it in this case. At all events, we may admit that his material body involuntarily shares in this expectation, to which his unregenerate soul responds with an indefinite longing. In this view the degradation of sin is fearfully manifest. Nature waits, but the natural man is indifferent or hostile. The very body which, in his blindness, he deems the source of sin, waits for glorification, while his soul uses its power over it to stifle the inarticulate desire. On the whole subject, see Usteri, *Stud. und Krit.*, 1832, pp. 835 ff., Tholuck, Meyer *in loco*, Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psych.*, pp. 57 ff. and pp. 476 ff. (a most profound and eloquent sermon on vers. 18–23). Comp. *Doctr. Notes*, and Dr. Lange, *Das Land der Herrlichkeit*.—R.]

For the earnest expectation of the creature. As the καραδοκεῖν means, strictly, *to expect with raised head*, it is very proper to regard the καραδοκία (intense expectation), and the ἀποκαραδοκία (Phil. i. 20) (intense longing, waiting for satisfaction), as an allusion to the conduct of irrational creatures in

* [The reasons for excluding man are: 1. Believers are distinguished here from the κτίσις (ver. 23). 2. Such an expectation does not exist in mankind as a whole. 3. Ver. 20 represents the subjection to vanity as unwilling, which is not true of man. 4. Ver. 21 implies that deliverance shall take place, and we have no evidence that this is true of humanity as a whole. If ver. 21 gives the purport of the "hope" (ver. 20), then this reason is of little weight.—R.]

reference to the future transformation of the sphere of nature.

Is waiting [ἀπεκδέχεται. Here, also, the preposition implies the continuance of the waiting until the time arrives.—R.] Even the poor creatures, whose heads are bowed toward the ground, now seized by a higher impulse, by a supernatural anticipation and longing, seem to stretch out their heads and look forth spiritually for a spiritual object of their existence, which is now burdened by the law of corruption.* Certainly this representation has the form of a poetical personification; but it cannot, on this account, be made equivalent, as Meyer holds (p. 255), to the usual prosopopœias in the Old Testament, although these declare, in a measure, the sympathy between the natural and human world. Meyer would exclude from the idea not only the angelic and demoniac kingdom, but also Christian and unchristian mankind. But how, then, would Paul have understood the groaning of the creature, without human sympathy?

The revelation of the sons (children) of God [τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ]. The children of God in the pregnant sense of His sons. The creature waits for its manifestation; that is, for the coming of its δόξα to full appearance (1 John iii. 2) with the coming of Christ (Matt. xxv. 31), which will be the appearing of the δόξα of the great God (Titus ii. 13); therefore the absolute ἀποκάλυψις itself,† the fulfilment of all the typical prophecies of nature—*and not only as complete restoration, but also as perfect development.*

Ver. 20. **For the creation was made subject** [ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη. Dr. Lange takes the verb as middle. It is the historical aorist, *at the fall of man.* See below. Comp. Gen. iii. 17, 18.—R.]. God was the one who subjected (so say most expositors)—[This is evident from the *curse,* if the reference be to the time of the fall.—R.];—not Adam (Knachtb., Capellus); nor man (Chrysostom, Schneckenburger); nor the devil (Hammond).

To vanity. Ματαιότης. The Septuagint, instead of הֶבֶל, שָׁוְא, רִיק. The word does not occur in the profane Greek; it means the superficial, intangible, and therefore deceptive appearance; the perishable and doomed to destruction having the show of reality. Earlier expositors (Tertullian, Bucer, and others) have referred the word to the μάταια = idols, understanding it as the deification of the creature. Yet the question here is a condition of the creature to which God has subjected it. Further on it is designated as δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς. Therefore Fritzsche's definition, *perversitas* (Adam's sin), is totally untenable. But what do we understand by "subject to ματαιότης"? Explanations:

1 An original disposition of creation; the arrangement of the corruption of the creature. (Grotius, Krebl, De Wette. Theodoret holds that the original arrangement was made with a view to the fall.)

2. A result of the fall of man. (The Hebrew theology, *Bereshith Rabba,* many Christian theologians. Œcumenius, Calvin, Meyer, and others). No 1 is opposed by the ὑπετάγη, &c. [by οὐχ ἑκοῦσα, ἀλλά, which presupposes a different previous condition, and by the historical fact (Gen. i. 31) Meyer—R.]; and No. 2 by the originality of the arrangement between a first created and a second spiritual stage of the cosmos (1 Cor. xv. 47, 48).

3. We must therefore hold, that Paul refers to the obscurity and disturbance of the first natural stage in the development of our cosmos produced by the fall.* As, in redemption, *the restoration* occurred simultaneously with the furtherance of the normal development, so death entered, at the fall, as a deterioration of the original metamorphoses, into the corruption of transitoriness. Tholuck approaches this explanation by this remark: "As the Rabbinical theology expresses the thought that man, born sinless, would have passed into a better condition 'by a kiss of the Highest,' so, in all probability has Paul regarded that ἀλλαγῆναι of which he speaks in 1 Cor. xv. 52 as the destination of the first man." Yet Tholuck seems, in reality, to adhere to De Wette's view.

Not willingly. The οὐχ ἑκοῦσα cannot mean merely the natural necessity peculiar to the creature-world; it applies rather to an opposition of ideal nature, in its ideal pressure toward development, to the decrees of death and of the curse of their real developing progress (Gen. iii.; 2 Cor. v. 1 ff.). Bucer: *Contra quam fert ingenium eorum, a natura enim omnes res a corruptione abhorrent.*

[**But by reason of him who hath subjected it,** ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα. Dr. Lange renders: the creature-world subjected itself to vanity, not willingly, but on account of Him who subjected it, in hope. The force of διά with the accusative is *on account of;* but the E. V. is correct, indicating a moving cause—*i. e.,* the will of God.—R.] This unwillingness is expressed, according to what follows, in the groaning of the whole creation. The translation: "it was made subject (ὑπετάγη, passive), by reason of Him who hath subjected the same," is opposed to the logical conception. [The simplest grammatical as well as logical interpretation accepts the verb as passive, with a reference to God as "Him who subjected the same." (So Meyer, Tholuck, Hodge, De Wette, Alford, and most commentators.)—R.] Moreover, the reference of the διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα to man, to Adam,† does not remove this logical difficulty, since, in that case, the ὑπετάγη would have to relate to another subject than the ὑποτάξαντα. We therefore find ourselves driven, with Fritzsche, to the middle construction

* [Comp. the analogous Old Testament expressions: Deut. xxxii. 1; Job xii. 7, 9; Ps. xix. 2; lxviii. 17; xcviii. 8; Isa. i. 2; xiv. 8; lv. 12; lxv. 17; Ezek. xxxi. 15; Hab. ii. 11. Also Rev. xxi; 2 Peter iii. 13; Acts iii. 21.—R.]

† [The reference to this event is undoubted. It is a new expression of the deep-seated consciousness of fellowship with Christ, which leads the Apostle to call this "the revelation of the sons of God," not of the *Son of God.* It should be remarked, that our Lord calls it the coming of the *Son of Man.* The event is throughout regarded in a strictly soteriological aspect.—R.]

* [The difference between 2 and 3 is slight. Both point to an actual curse at the fall; the latter only adds the thought, that the previous condition was not, after all, the final one, thus preparing the way for an explanation of "not willingly." Both should, it seems, include the thought that the glorification to ensue will transcend both the original state and that which could be attained by a normal development.—R.]

† [The objection to this reference is well stated by Alford: (1.) The verb implies a conscious act of intentional subjugation. (2.) The accusative (indicating the moving, rather than the efficient cause) is in keeping with the Apostle's reverence; thus removing the supreme will of God to a wider distance from corruption and vanity. Meyer suggests that the absence of any explanatory cause presupposes a well-known subject; God had subjected it. Jowett makes Christ the subject: "on account of whose special work the creature was made subject to vanity." This is novel, so much so, that it seems far-fetched.—R.]

of ὑπετάγη. Thereby we gain the idea, that even the disharmony which nature had suffered has become, in turn, a kind of order, since nature has been found in the service of corruption by virtue of its elasticity, relative dependence, plasticity, and pliability, and its absolute dependence upon God; and pious nature is all the dearer to God because it is subjected in hope. [So Hodge, accepting the middle sense: the creature submitted to the yoke of bondage in hope of ultimate deliverance.—R.]

[**In hope**, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι. Not precisely *in a state of*, which would be expressed by ἐν, but resting *on hope* (De Wette: *auf Hoffnung hin*).—R.] This means not merely, "hope was left to it" (Tholuck), but it is also a motive of positive hope in suffering nature. Just as the fallen human world shall be led in its ἀποκατάστασις beyond its primitive paradisaical glory, so shall nature come through this humiliation to a richer elevation, namely, as the transformed organism of the glorified Christ and His joint-heirs. The ἐπ' ἐλπίδι must be joined with ὑπετάγη, not with διὰ τ. ὑποτ. (Vulgate, Luther, and others). [The question of connection is a difficult one. Of the two views here mentioned, Dr. Lange rightly prefers the former, since the latter would attribute the hope to the one subjecting, not the one subjected (Alford). Ewald, making all that precedes in this verse parenthetical, joins *in hope* with ver. 19, and thus finds a reason for the emphatic repetition of κτίσις in ver. 21. See *Textual Note* [6], where the view of Forbes is given. It seems to give greater clearness to the passage as a whole. —R.]

Ver. 21. **That the creation itself also** [ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις. See *Textual Note* [6]. The current of exegesis sets strongly in favor of the view which connects ὅτι with ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, in the sense of *that*. Alford, who, in his commentary, defends *because*, is one of the authors of a revision which adopts *that*. Meyer suggests that the purport of the hope must be given, in order to prove the expectation of the κτίσις *as directed precisely toward the manifestation of the sons of God*. Alford indeed objects, that this subjective signification of the clause would attribute "to the yearnings of creation, *intelligence* and *rationality*—consciousness of itself and of God;" but the same objection might be urged against the reference of κτίσις to inanimate creation, in vers. 19, 20, 22, as well as here. If the figurative idea of longing be admitted at all, it may be carried out to this extent with equal propriety. The repetition may be readily accounted for, either by considering ver. 20 parenthetical, or by regarding αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις as emphatic.—R.] This explains the hope of the creature-world introduced in the preceding verse. With Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others, we regard the καὶ αὐτὴ as a higher degree, *itself also*, and not merely as an expression of equality, *also it*. Meyer says, that the context says nothing of gradation. But the gradation lies essentially in the fact that the creature-world constitutes a humiliation in opposition to spiritual life, especially for contemplating the old world.

Shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption [ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς]. We do not hold (with Tholuck, Meyer, and others) that τῆς φθορᾶς is the genitive of apposition. For the question is, in the first place, concerning a bondage *under* vanity; so that the creature, even in its deliverance, will remain in a state of the δουλεία in relation to the children of God himself. The φθόρα is not altogether the same as ματαιότης, but its manifestation in the process of finite life is sickness, death, the pangs of death, and corruption; while the ματαιότης, as such, is veiled in the semblance of a blooming, incorruptible life. [There seems to be no good reason for objecting to the view of Tholuck, Meyer, Philippi, and others, that the *bondage*, which results from the *vanity*, and is borne *not willingly* (ver. 20), *consists in corruption*. This preserves the proper distinctions. The corruption is the consequence of the vanity; the unwilling subjection to a condition which is *under vanity*, and results in *corruption*, is well termed *bondage*.—R.] The alteration of the expression φθόρα into an adjective, "corruptible bondage" (Köllner), is as unwarranted as the translation of the ἐλευθερία τῆς δόξης by *glorious liberty* (Luther [E. V.]).

[**Into the freedom of the glory of the children of God**, εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ. The construction is pregnant. (So Meyer: *Aecht Griechische Prägnanz*. See Winer, p. 577.) We may supply: καὶ κατασταθήσεται, or εἰςαχθήσεται, *shall be brought* or *introduced* into, &c. The freedom is to consist in, or at least to result from a share in, the glory of the children of God. Hence the hendiadys of the E. V. (glorious liberty) is totally incorrect. It makes the most prominent idea of the whole clause a mere attributive. Besides, were the meaning that expressed by the E. V., we should find this form: εἰς τὴν δόξαν τῆς ἐλευθερίας τῶν τέκ. τ. θεοῦ.—R.] The εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν can mean only the sharing in the liberty of God's children by the organic appropriation on their part, and by the equality with the children of God produced by means of the transformation; but it cannot mean an independent state of liberty beside them. Their freedom will consist in its helping to constitute the glory, the spiritualized splendor of the manifestation of God's children. As Christ is the manifestation of God's glory because He is illuminated throughout by God, and the sons of God are the glory of Christ as lights from His light, so will nature be the glory of God's sons as humanized and deified nature. Yet we would not therefore take the τῆς δόξης as the genitive of apposition, since the glory proceeds outwardly from within, and since it is here promised to nature as recompense, so to speak, in opposition to the corruption. It shall therefore share, in its way, in the glory belonging to God's children. But why is not the ἀφθαρσία, incorruption, mentioned (1 Cor. xv. 45), in opposition to the φθόρα, corruption? Because the idea of *corruption* has been preceded by that of *vanity*. The real glory of the manifestation in which its inward incorruption shall hereafter be externally revealed, is contrasted with the deceptive, transitory glory of the manifestation in which the creature-world in this life appears subject to vanity. The elevation of the children of God themselves from the condition of corruption to the condition of glorification, constitutes the centre of the deliverance into this state of glory; but the creature is drawn upward in this elevation, in conformity with its dynamical dependence on the centre, and its organic connection with it.*

* [This verse, which, taken in its subjective sense, as the purport of the hope, seems to favor the reference of κτίσις to humanity, and the longing to the instincts of immortality (so Stuart throughout), loses its force if thus un-

Ver. 22. **For we know that the whole creation** [*οἴδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις*]. The Apostle furnishes, in ver. 22, *for we know*, the proof of the declaration in ver. 21. Since he has proved the proposition of ver. 19 by ver. 20, and of ver. 20 by ver. 21, Meyer, without ground, goes back with this *for* to ver. 20: *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι*; De Wette [Philippi], to ver. 19. [If ver. 21 be taken as stating the purport of the hope, then Meyer's view is the most tenable one. Philippi finds here a more general affirmation of the existence of the "patient expectation," as an admitted truth.—R.]

Tholuck asks, Whence does the Apostle have this *we know*? and he opposes the view that it is an assumption of the universal human consciousness (according to most expositors), or rather, that the Apostle seems (according to Bucer, Brenz) to speak from the Jewish-Christian hope which rested on the prophets, as, even in chap. ii. 2; iii. 19; vii. 14; viii. 28, the *οἴδαμεν* is understood best as the Christian consciousness.* We must not subject the Apostle to the modern sense of nature. But we can still less reduce the Apostle's knowledge to that of the prophets. The modern sense of nature, in its sound elements, is a fruit of apostolical Christianity; and as the harmony between spirit and nature has been essentially consummated in Christ, so, too, has the knowledge of the language (that is, the spiritual meaning) of nature been consummated in Him—a knowledge which was reproduced in the apostles as a fountain, and ready for enlargement. This knowledge is, indeed, universally human chiefly in elect souls alone, under the condition of Divine illumination.

Groaneth together and travaileth in pain together [*συνστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει*]. The *συν* in *συνστενάζει* and *συνωδίνει* has been referred, by Œcumenius, Calvin, and others, to the children of God; Köllner, and others, have viewed it as a mere strengthening of the simple word. Tholuck and Meyer explain it, in harmony with Theodore of Mopsvestia, as a collective disposition of the creature. The latter: *βούλεται δὲ εἰπεῖν, ὅτι σύμφωνος ἐπιδείκνυται τοῦτο πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις*. Estius: *genitus et dolor communis inter se partium creaturæ*. On the linguistic tenableness of this explanation, by accepting the presumed organization of nature in single parts, see Meyer, against Fritzsche. It is, indeed, against the reference of the *συν* to the groaning of Christians that this groaning is introduced further on as something special.

Reiche holds that *συνωδίνει* refers to the eschatological expectation of the Jews, the חֶבְלֵי־הַמָּשִׁיחַ *dolores messiæ*; against which Meyer properly observes, that those *dolores messiæ* are special sufferings which were to precede the appearance of the Messiah; but the travailing of nature had taken place from the beginning, since Gen. iii. 17. Yet Tholuck remarks, with propriety, that the Apostle must have been acquainted with that term of Rabbinical theology. Likewise the developing suffering of nature will ascend toward the end to a decisive crisis (see the eschatological words of Jesus). But the "*dolores messiæ*" comprise also ethical conflicts. Therefore this continuous travailing of the world's development is related to the *dolores messiæ*, as the preparation is to the fulfilment, or as the judgment of the world, immanent in the history of the world, is related to the final catastrophe. The *ὠδίνειν* denotes the birth-pangs of a woman in labor. The figure is happily chosen, not only because it announces a new birth and new form of the earth, but because it reflects in travailing Eve the fate of the travailing earth, and *vice versâ*. Tholuck: "By pain, it will wrest the new out of the old; perhaps *στενάζειν* has reference to bringing forth (comp. Jer. iv. 31), but better, as Luther explains the *στεναγμοί*, ver. 26, *the groaning, earnest expectation*, which is intensified by the being in travail which follows." Yet the groaning also indicates the painful announcement of positive sufferings, which subsequently arise from the groaning of Christians for redemption (*στενάζομεν βαρούμενοι*, 2 Cor. v. 4).

[**Until now**, *ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν*. Any reference to the future is forbidden by the use of *οἴδαμεν*, which refers to experience (Alford). While it is not necessary to insist upon an important distinction between *μέχρι* and *ἄχρι* (see p. 181), it would seem best to consider that the idea of duration* is the prominent one here. If any point of time is emphasized, it must be that of the beginning of the groaning, when the curse of wearying labor and travail came upon man, and through him the curse upon nature.—R.]

Ver. 23. **And not only so, but even we ourselves** [*οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοί*. See *Textual Notes* [6] and [7]. The reading of the Vaticanus is followed here.] Meyer's mode of stating the connection with the preceding verse is utterly incorrect: "Climax of the previous proof that the *κτίσις* in ver. 21 is correct in the *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, ὅτι*. Even we Christians would, indeed, do nothing less than unite in that groaning." The principal thought is, not the deliverance of the *κτίσις*, vers. 20, 21, *but the future glory of the children of God*, ver. 18. The first proof therefor is the groaning of nature; the second, which now follows, is the groaning of spiritual life. Therefore Christians do not unite in anywise in the groaning of creation, but *vice versâ*: the groaning of creation joins in the groaning of Christians. Consequently, we must not translate: "But also we (Christians) *on our part*," &c., but: even we *Christians ourselves*—namely, we who are most intimately concerned. The expression *καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν*

derstood. The striking phrase: "the freedom of the glory of the children of God," becomes very vague, unless we adopt the view that nature is here personified as in expectation. And it is easier to believe that the verse is true of all nature, than of all men. Whatever may be our wishes, the sharing of nature in the future glory is more probable, judging from the facts of the material world, than the participation of all men in the same, judging from the facts of the moral world. The sighs after immortality among the heathen are audible enough; but had Paul referred to these, he would undoubtedly have spoken more distinctly of the future conversion of the heathen. He is too fond of references to his personal Saviour and His work, to omit every allusion to these, where his thought really concerns the salvation of persons. It seems, therefore, in the highest degree improbable that mankind (as distinguished from the natural world) is referred to at all. —R.]

* [Professor Stuart urges that the longing of the natural world was not so familiar to all, that the Apostle could thus appeal to consciousness. But this objection is of weight only in case the meaning of *οἴδαμεν* be extended to human consciousness in general. That Paul uses it in appeals to Christian consciousness, is evident from Rom. ii. 2; iii. 19; vii. 14; viii. 26, 28; 2 Cor. v. 1; 1 Tim. i. 8; comp. the frequent use of *οἴδατε* in 1 Cor. vi.—R.]

* [Calvin: "*Particula Hactenus, vel ad hunc usque diem, ad levandum diuturni languoris tædium pertinet. Nam si tot seculis durarunt in suo gemitu creaturæ, quam inexcusabilis erit nostra mollities vel ignavia, si in brevi umbratilis vitæ curriculo deficimus!*"—R.]

ἑαυτοῖς brings out prominently the truth that these same Christians, who have the first-fruits of the Spirit, are also saved by hope, though at heart they must still groan and earnestly expect. Thus αὐτὸς ἐγώ, in chap. vii. 25, means: I, one and the same man, can be so different; with the mind I can serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin. Tholuck: "The difference between the readings seems to have arisen rather from purposes of *perspicuity* or *style*." Augustine, Chrysostom, and others, hold that the connection—in which the subject is Christians in general—is decidedly against the odd limitation of the αὐτοί to the apostles (Origen, Ambrose, Melanchthon, and Grotius. Reiche, and others: the Apostle Paul alone. Others: Paul, with the other apostles). The former expositors maintain that the second καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοί consists, in a more intense degree, of the apostles.* But the addition is rather occasioned by the contrast presented: saved, and yet groaning ("the inward life of Christians shines").

Though we have the first-fruits of the Spirit [τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες. The participle may be taken as simply defining the subject: *we ourselves*, those who have (Luther, Calvin, Beza, Hodge); or be rendered: *though we have*, despite this privilege. The latter is more forcible; the former sense would require the article οἱ (Tholuck, Philippi, Meyer, Alford). Ἀπαρχή in itself occasions no difficulty; it means *first-fruits*, with the implied idea of a future harvest. Comp., however, chap. xi. 16.—R.] The ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ πνεύμ. is differently interpreted.

1. The genitive is partitive, having this sense: the apostles (they alone, according to Origen, Œcumenius, Melanchthon, and Grotius), and the Christians of the apostolic period, have the first foretaste of a spiritual endowment, which, when complete, will extend to all future Christians (De Wette, Köllner, Olshausen, Meyer). But by this division the Apostle would not only have adjudged to later Christians the full harvest of the Spirit, which is contrary to the real fact, but he would also have obscured rather than strengthened his argument by a superfluous remark. For it is a fact, which will ever remain perfectly the same from the time of the apostles to the end of the world, that the life of Christians in the Spirit is related to their physical perfection and glorification, as the firstlings are to the harvest. But the following division has just as little force.

2. Our present reception of the Spirit is only preliminary, in contrast with the future complete outpouring in the kingdom of heaven (Chrysostom, and others; also Huther, Calvin, Beza, Tholuck, Philippi [Hodge, Alford, Stuart]). Apart from the fact that this view is not altogether apostolical, it adds nothing to the matter in question, and removes the point of view: the inference of the future δόξα from the present πνεῦμα.

3. Therefore the genitive of apposition.† The Holy Spirit is himself the gift of the first-fruits, if the completion of Christian life is regarded as the harvest (Bengel, Winer, Rückert, and others). The Spirit is the earnest, ἀῤῥαβών, of the future perfection (2 Cor. i. 22; v. 5; Gal. vi. 8). Eph. i. 14, iv. 30; and 1 Peter iv. 14, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς δόξης, are of special importance. Meyer's only objection to this explanation is, that the Apostle's expression would have been misunderstood, since the ἀπαρχή would have to be understood as a part of a similar whole. But the sheaves offered as first-fruits are not merely the first portions of the first sheaves collectively; they are the precious tokens and sure pledges of the full harvest, to which they constitute, if we may so speak, a harmonious antithesis. But the δόξα must be regarded as commensurate with the spiritual life; yet not as a new and *higher* outpouring of the Spirit, but as the perfect epiphany of the operation of the Spirit. Tholuck admits, at least, that this third explanation is also admissible with the second. On the singular explanations of Fritzsche and Schneckenburger, see Meyer.

Even we ourselves groan within ourselves [καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν. We, although we have the first-fruits, are far from being complete; despite this, we groan within ourselves. The inward, profound nature of the feeling is thus emphasized.—R.] Groaning is the expression of the longing which feels that it is delayed in its course toward its object; expression of the inclination contending immediately with its obstacles.

Waiting for the adoption [υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι. Wait for, await, wait to the end of (Alford). The adoption is already ours (ver 15) as an internal relation, but the outward condition does not yet correspond (Meyer). Alford paraphrases: *awaiting the fulness of our adoption*.—R.]. The object of the longing is the υἱοθεσία, which believers wait for in perfect patience. This is here identified with the redemption of our body. It is the perfect outward manifestation of the inward υἱοθεσία; it is the soul's inheritance of the glorified life which is attained on the perfect deliverance of the body from the bondage of the first state of nature, and from subjection to death and corruption; see 2 Cor. v. 4. The Apostle's addition of "the redemption of our body," proves that he does not mean merely the entire υἱοθεσία, but this υἱοθεσία viewed specifically as complete.

[**The redemption of our body**, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν. Epexegetical clause.] Τοῦ σώματος is explained by Erasmus, Luther, and others (also Lutz, *Bibl. Dogm.*), as redemption from the body; but this is totally foreign to the connection, and also to the matter itself. [Were this the meaning, there would probably be some qualifying term added, as Phil. iii. 21 (Meyer). —R.] Tholuck explains the redemption of the body as applying to its materiality; this is also the object

* [Alford, who adopts ἡμεῖς with the second καὶ αὐτοί, says it is "inserted to involve himself and his fellow-workers in the general description of the last clause." —R.]

† [Both 1 and 2 take the genitive as partitive, which is undoubtedly the common usage. In every case in the New Testament where ἀπαρχή is followed by a genitive, it has this force; comp. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xv. 20; xvi. 15; John i. 18. The same is true of the LXX. and classical authors. It is difficult to sustain any other view here. If we adopt the meaning, the first-fruits of a harvest, which *is* the Spirit given to us, and refer it to the common gift of the Spirit in this life, rather than to the gift of the Spirit in that particular age, all seems to be gained that Dr. Lange seeks in view 3, while we do not unnecessarily depart from the *usus loquendi*. The reference to the first Christians is perhaps slightly favored by adopting ἡμεῖς at some point in the text, although Meyer rejects it, and yet upholds this reference. In his comments on ver. 26, Dr. Lange says that here the new spiritual life is spoken of, not the Holy Spirit itself. This subjective sense can only be admitted if the partitive sense of the genitive be given up. The term "body" cannot, in any case, be regarded as antithetical; did "flesh" occur, there might be some reason for taking "Spirit" in this sense of "spiritual life," a meaning for which our author has an unusual fondness —R.]

of the earnest expectation of the κτίσις. Perhaps this is from Origen and Rothe; see, on the contrary, 1 Cor. xv. Tholuck's quotation from Augustine is better (*De doctr. christ.*): *Quod nonnulli dicunt, malle se omnino esse sine corpore, omnino falluntur, non enim corpus suum sed corruptiones et pondus oderunt;* Phil. iii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. The most untenable view is: deliverance from the morally injurious influence of the body by death (Carpzov, and others). [It is so natural to refer this phrase to the glorification of the body at the coming of Christ, that it is unnecessary to state arguments in favor of this reference (comp. Phil. iii. 21; 2 Cor. v. 2 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 42 ff.). The redemption is not complete until the body is redeemed. Any other view is not accordant with the grand current of thought in this chapter. The fact that even here, where the longing of Christians is described, so much stress should be laid on the redemption of the body, the material part of our complex nature, confirms the view of κτίσις, which takes it as including material existences. In fact, since "even we ourselves" are represented as waiting for an event, which shall redeem that part of our nature most akin to the creation (in the restricted sense of Meyer, and others), it would appear that the subject here is not necessarily in antithesis to "creation," but rather a part of it; "subjected in hope," like the whole creation, but also as having the first-fruits of the Spirit, "saved in hope" (ver. 24).—R.]

Ver. 24. **For we were saved.** (ἐσώθημεν.) Delivered, and participating in salvation. The dative τῇ ἐλπίδι, **in hope**, does not describe the means, but the mode of the deliverance. [So Bengel, and many others. Comp. Winer, p. 208. The phrase is emphatically placed. Luther is excellent: we are indeed saved, yet in hope.—R.] Even if we were to admit that the Apostle understood faith to be the hope here mentioned (Chrysostom, De Wette, and others)—which, as Meyer correctly observes, is controverted by Paul's definite distinction between faith and hope,*—the admission of the dative of instrument would be too strong. But even if we accept the dative as denoting modality, it does not denote "that to which the ἐσώθ. is to be regarded as confined" (Meyer), but the condition: *in hope of.* Therefore the ἐσώθημεν must be here explained conformably to the conception of the υἱοθεσία in ver. 23, not as being the principial attainment of salvation in the Spirit—which is already complete there—but as being the perfect attainment of salvation in glory. This has become the portion of Christians, but in such a way that their faith is supplemented by their hope. They have the inward υἱοθεσία in the *witness* of the Spirit; but the υἱοθεσία of δόξα in the *pledge* of the Spirit.

Now hope that is seen is not hope [ἐλπὶς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς]. Tholuck: the second ἐλπίς is concrete, the object of hope. [This usage is common in emphatic phrases in all languages (Philippi). Comp. Col. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 1; Heb. vi. 18, where ἐλπίς is objective.—R.] Luther: "The word *hope* is used in two ways. In one case it means great courage, which remains firm in all temptations; in the other, the finite salvation which hope shall get; here it may mean both." Seeing means, here, the acquired presence of the object, which can be "grasped with the hands;" however, the beholding also may momentarily afford heavenly satisfaction; see 1 Cor. xiii.; 2 Cor. v. 7.

For what a man seeth [ὃ γὰρ βλέπει τις]. Thus the hope of believers proves that they are to *expect* a state of completion, but that they must *wait for* it perseveringly.

Why doth he still hope for? [τί καὶ ἐλπίζει; See *Textual Note* [16]. Adopting καί as well established, it seems best to take it as = *etiam* (Meyer). Why does he still hope, when there is no more ground for it? Comp. Hartung, *Partikellehre*, i. p. 137, on this use of καί. Bengel: *cum visione non est spe opus.*—R.]

Ver. 25. **But if we hope for that,** &c. Hope is no vain dreaming; it is proved as *religious* confidence in the *ethical* labor of patience. The ὑπομονή denotes perseverance amid obstacles; therefore always, also passiveness, or patience and steadfastness. But the connection here authorizes the predominance of the former idea. And though complete salvation comes from the future and from above, patience in this life must coöperate with its future—therefore: to persevere.* Grotius: *Spes ista non infructuosa est in nobis, sed egregiam virtutem operatur, malorum fortem tolerantiam.*

Ver. 26. **Likewise the Spirit also** [ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα. *Likewise* (ὡσαύτως) introduces, as contemporaneous with the "waiting" (ver. 23), the divine assistance of the Holy Spirit (Tholuck).—R.] De Wette and Meyer explain: The Holy Spirit. The latter commentator appeals to vers. 16, 23. But, in ver. 23, the new spiritual life is spoken of,† which certainly consists in the fellowship of the human spirit with the Holy Spirit, but is, nevertheless, not the Holy Spirit itself. To say of the Holy Spirit in himself that He groans—indeed, that He gives vent to groanings which are unutterable by Him—is altogether inadmissible. Neither can we, with Nösselt, substitute the gospel; nor, with Morus, the Christian disposition; nor, with Köllner, the Christian element of life. According to the opposition of πνεῦμα and νοῦς in 1 Cor. xiv. 14, it is the new basis of life, which constitutes to the conscious daily life an opposition of the life which, though apparently unconscious, is really the higher consciousness itself, the heavenly sense of the awakened soul. As, in the unconverted state, the influences of the unconscious basis of the soul invade the conscious daily life with demoniacal temptation, so, *vice versâ*, does the unconscious spiritual life of the converted man come as a guardian spirit to the help of the daily life. Therefore the groaning of the spirit itself (see ver. 15) corresponds with the groaning of the consciousness

* [De Wette urges the instrumental sense, on account of the definite aorist; but the fact of salvation is regarded as placing us in a condition of hope. The hope differs from faith, but is inseparably connected with it. Alford says the hope is "faith in its prospective altitude." Philippi: "Inasmuch as the object of salvation is both relatively present and also relatively future, hope is produced from faith and indissolubly linked with it; for faith apprehends the object, in so far as it is present; hope, in so far as it is still future."—R.]

* [On ὑπομονή, see p. 162; also Col. i. 11; Lange's *Comm.*, p. 19. *Constancy* seems to be always prominent in the word. The preposition διά with the genitive denotes that through which, as a medium, our waiting takes place (Alford). It is more than an accompaniment—it is the state which characterizes the waiting throughout. On the connection of hope and patience, comp. 1 Thess. i. 3; Heb x. 36.—R.]

† [Against this, see notes *in loco*, where Dr. Lange himself does not defend this view. It is opposed to the most natural grammatical construction of that passage, and objectionable on other grounds. Comp. the additional notes on vers. 16 23, and the excursus, chap. vii.—R.]

in its natural feeling. [This position of Dr. Lange is not in accordance with the view of the best modern commentators. Tholuck, De Wette, Ewald, Stuart, Hodge, Philippi, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth, Jowett, as well as the older commentators in general, all refer it to the objective, Holy Spirit. Olshausen, however, adopts the subjective sense. The proof must be very strong which will warrant us in referring it to any thing other than the Holy Spirit itself; for the Apostle uses τὸ πνεῦμα, as he has done in vers. 23, 16, &c., where the Holy Spirit is meant. The only reason urged against such a meaning here is, that the "groaning," &c., cannot be predicated of Him. But we have no right to depart from the obvious meaning, because, in the *next clause*, that is predicated which, we fancy, cannot be predicated of the Holy Spirit. The predicate in this clause cannot, with strict propriety, be referred to any spirit save the Holy Spirit. That Dr. Lange's view weakens the thought, is also evident.—R.]

Helpeth our weakness [συναντιλαμβάνεται τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν. See *Textual Note* [11]. On the verb, comp. Luke x. 40, where Martha asks that Mary be bidden to *help* her—*i. e., take hold of in connection with.* It requires a weakening of its force to make this applicable to the new spiritual life. The subjective side has been brought out in vers. 23–25. Hence a reference to the Holy Spirit accords with the progress of thought.—R.] Meyer urges, with Beza, the συν in συναντιλ.: *ad nos laborantes refertur.* At all events, it would refer to only the conscious side of our effort. But it is clear, from the further definition, that ἀσθένεια is the only correct reading. Tholuck understands this ἀσθένεια as referring to occasions of invading faintness. But the Apostle speaks of a permanent relation of our weakness in this life, which certainly becomes more prominent in special temptations. This is the incongruity between the new principle and the old psychical and carnal life.

[The singular must be accepted as the true reading. It then refers to a state of weakness, already described (ver. 23). The dative, as in Luke x. 40, denotes not the burden which the Spirit helps us bear (so Hodge, and many others), but that which it helps. (Alford: "helps *our weakness—us who are weak*, to bear the burden of ver. 23." Meyer: "*Er legt mit Hand an mit unserer Schwachheit.*") It should not be limited to weakness in prayer (Bengel), but is the general weakness in our waiting for final redemption.—R.]

For we know not what we should pray for as we ought [τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθὸ δεῖ οὐκ οἴδαμεν. Τό belongs to the whole clause. Γάρ introduces an illustration of our weakness, and how it is helped. The aorist προσευξώμεθα, which we accept as the correct reading, is more usual than the future, but either is grammatically admissible. See Winer, p. 280.—R.] Tholuck holds that this *not knowing* refers to special states of obscure faith, and has a twofold meaning: ignorance of the object toward which prayer should be directed, and the language in which we should pray. But the supposition of special states is incorrect; otherwise the expression would be: we often do not know. But the language can by no means be under consideration, neither can a mere ignorance of the object be meant. Therefore De Wette and Meyer explain thus: we do not know what, *under existing circumstances*, it is necessary to pray for. We refer the καθὸ δεῖ as well to the heavenly clearness of the object of redemption as to the subjective purity, definiteness, and energy of desire corresponding to it.* The conscious, verbal prayer is related to the spirit of prayer, as the fallible dictate of conscience is to the infallible conscience.

But the Spirit itself intercedeth [ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει. On the omission of ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (*Rec.*), which Meyer finds in the verb itself, see *Textual Note* [12]. The verb occurs only here. The simple verb means, to meet; then, compounded with ἐν, to approach in order to make supplication (Acts xxv. 24, ἐντυγχάνειν); the ὑπερ seems to show that the supplication is in favor of the persons in question. Dr. Lange rejects this, in order to avoid a reference to the Holy Spirit.—Αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα brings into prominence the Intercessor, who knows our wants (Tholuck, Alford). —R.] Since the ὑπερεντυγχάνει must be read without the addition of the *Recepta*, we refer the ὑπερ to our want in not knowing what to pray for, as it is proper for us, and in harmony with our destiny. Tholuck regards the ὑπερ as merely a higher degree, as in ὑπερπερισσεύειν; Meyer [so Philippi] sees here a ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, according to the analogy of ὑπεραποκρίνομαι, &c.

With groanings which cannot be uttered [στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις]. Analogous to 1 Cor. xiv. 14; against which Tholuck remarks, that there the subject in question is the human πνεῦμα. Meyer even declares that those explanations are rationalistic which do not interpret the πνεῦμα to be the Holy Spirit (Reiche: the Christian sense; Köllner: the Spirit obtained in Christ). Chrysostom's calling it the χάρισμα εὐχῆς, and Theodoret's not understanding by the expression the ὑπόστασις of the Spirit, are declared to be an arbitrary alteration. Meyer does not accede to the opinion of Augustine, and most commentators, that the sense is, that man himself, stirred up by the Holy Ghost, utters groanings. It is rather the Holy Spirit himself; but certainly He needs the human organ for His groanings. He claims that the analogy, "that demons speak and cry out of men," is adapted to this view. The analogy of demoniacal possession! Besides, Meyer, in his exposition of the ἀλαλήτοις, prefers the interpretation of most expositors, *unutterable*, to the opposite rendering, *unuttered, dumb* (Grotius, Fritzsche, and others), because it denotes greater intensity But we get from this the result, that the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God in His glory, not only groans, but also cannot utter His groans.

[Notwithstanding this attempt at a *reductio ad absurdum*, the view must still be held, that the Holy Spirit is here represented as interceding. To avoid this conclusion, Dr. Lange must first weaken the subject into the human spirit, and then the force of ὑπερ in the verb. It is far better to accept the obvious sense, and then explain it in a way which escapes the extreme conclusions of Meyer. The Holy Spirit is here spoken of as dwelling in us; in this indwelling He makes the intercession. This view presents no absurdity; it rather accepts the

* [Dr. Hodge refers to the fact that heathen philosophers urged this as a reason why men ought not to pray The Apostle intimates that what is true of men in general is true still of Christians (οἴδαμεν), because their knowledge is as yet in no respect such as to make their prayer (καθὸ δεῖ) as it ought to be. Hence the reference is to a continuing state, rather than to times of special weakness.—R.]

prominent thought of the previous part of the chapter (vers. 9, 11, 14, 16), and implies not only that, by this indwelling, we are taught to pray what would otherwise be unutterable (Calvin, Beza), but that the Holy Ghost "himself pleads in our prayers, raising us to higher and holier desires than we can express in words, which can only find utterance in sighings and aspirations" (Alford). So Hodge, Stuart, De Wette, and most commentators.—R.]

On the threefold view of ἀλάλητοις (not utterable, not spoken, not speaking), see Tholuck.*

Ver. 27. **But he who searcheth the hearts** [ὁ δὲ ἐρευνῶν τὰς καρδίας. Δέ is slightly adversative: These groanings are unutterable, but He, &c. The ἐρευνῶν describes God according to the Old Testament phraseology (1 Sam. xvi. 7; Ps. vii. 10; Prov. xv. 11), as omniscient.—R.] In 1 Cor. ii. 10 it is said of the Holy Spirit that He searcheth all things; here, according to the just cited reference of the groaning Spirit to the Holy Spirit, this very Holy Spirit would be an object of the searching God. [This objection is of little weight, since the object of the all-searching God is the mind of the Spirit, hidden (even to us) in the unutterable sighings, &c.—R.]

The mind of the Spirit. His φρόνημα; see chap. viii. 6. His purely divine and ideal striving, but here as clear thought, denoting the excogitated sense of that language of groans. [If the reference to the Holy Spirit be accepted, then the sense not even excogitated by us is included.—R.]

Because he pleadeth for the saints [ὅτι . . . ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἁγίων. How can the human spirit, even when possessed by the Holy Spirit, be said to plead for the saints?—R.] The explanation of ὅτι by *for* [because], according to most expositors (De Wette, Philippi, &c.), is opposed by Meyer (in accordance with Grotius, Fritzsche, Tholuck, and others), who urges instead of it, *that.* A very idle thought: God knows the mind of the Holy Spirit, *that* He intercedes for the saints in a way well-pleasing to God. The οἶδε is perfectly plain in itself, even if not taken in the pregnant sense (with Calvin and Ruckert).† He knows well that He, as the searcher of hearts (Ps. cxxxix. 1) and as hearer, is conscious of the thought and pure purpose of these holy groans. Wherefore? *Because it is well-pleasing to God.*

[**According to the will of God** (κατὰ θεόν) is the correct paraphrase of the E. V.—R.] Not, according to Deity (Origen); nor *before* God, nor *with* God (Reiche, Fritzsche); nor *by* God, by virtue of God (Tholuck.—How can we hold that the Holy Ghost should intercede because of God's impulse?), but according to God, in harmony with the Divine will (Meyer).‡ The Divine impulse is, indeed, indirectly implied here; but then it follows again, that the groaning Spirit cannot be identical with the Holy Spirit. [Not with the Holy Spirit as without us, but as within us.—R.]

SECOND PARAGRAPH, VERS. 28–37.

Ver. 28. **And we know** [οἴδαμεν δέ. Meyer, Philippi, and others, take δέ as introducing a general ground after the more special ones in vers. 26, 27. Alford finds it slightly adversative, the antithesis being found in ver. 22. The former is preferable. Οἴδαμεν, Christian consciousness.—R.] The subjective assurance of the future consummation reaches its climax in the fact that believers are lovers of God. But in this form it indicates the objective certainty, which is its lowest foundation. However, instead of the most direct inference, that those who love God are previously beloved by Him, and are established on God's love (an inference controlling this whole section; see vers. 29, 31, 32, 35, 39), the Apostle applies this inference to the condition of Christians in this world. The whole world seems to contradict their hope of future glory. All things visible, especially the hatred of the hostile world, seem to oppose and gainsay their faith. And yet this fearful appearance can have no force, since all things are subject to the omnipotent and wise administration of God, on whose loving counsel their confidence is established. Still more, if all things are subject to God's supreme authority, and this authority is exhibited in the development of His loving counsel, they know, with the full certainty of faith, that all things work together for their good. This follows, first, from the decree, plan, and order of salvation (vers. 28–30). It follows, second, from God's arrangement, act, and facts of salvation (vers. 31–34). It follows, third, from the experience proved in the Old Testament, that the Lord's companions in salvation and the covenant are His companions in suffering, as His companions in conflict; but as His companions in suffering, they are also His companions in victory, for whose glorification all surmounted obstacles are transformed into means of advancement (vers. 35–37). The conclusion (vers. 38, 39) expresses so strongly the subjective, and also the objective certainty of the future completion, that we believe it necessary to make it prominent as a special paragraph.

That all things, πάντα; not merely all *events* (Meyer), or all afflictions (Tholuck) [Calvin, Hodge, Stuart]; for, besides events (ver. 35), all the powers of the world are mentioned (vers. 38, 39).—**Work together,** συνεργεῖ.* The beautiful and correct term, *serve* for the good of, must nevertheless follow the more specific definition. For the principal factor of the completion of Christians is the central one: Christ over them and in them, the love of Christ or the Spirit of glory, the free and dominant impulse of their new life. With this first and central factor there now coöperates the second

* [The meaning *unutterable*, which cannot be expressed in words, is favored by the analogy of verbals in -τος, and is adopted by Luther, Calvin, Beza, Meyer, Tholuck, De Wette, Hodge, Stuart, Alford, and many others. Philippi admits this sense, but includes with it that of *unspoken*, which are not expressed in words. Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 4; 1 Peter i. 8.—R.]

† [It is held by many commentators (among them Stuart, Hodge, Meyer), that if ὅτι be taken as causal, οἶδε must be rendered *approves; i. e.*, He approves what is the mind of the Spirit, *because*, &c. Dr. Lange's estimate of Meyer's interpretation is very just, and he seems to be equally correct in denying the necessity for the pregnant sense of οἶδε. Comp. Alford *in loco*. The E. V. is exceedingly happy in its rendering of this verse.—R.]

‡ [Alford: "All these pleadings of the Spirit are heard and answered, even when inarticulately uttered. We may extend the same comforting assurance to the *imperfect and mistaken verbal utterances* of our prayers, which are no themselves answered to our hurt, but the answer is given to the voice of the Spirit, which speaks through them, which we *would* express, but *cannot*."—R.]

* [See *Textual Note* [14]. Tholuck would refer the σύν to the loving God, but the simplest sense is that of coöperating (Bengel, Alford, and others). Meyer, however, finds in it the idea of the fellowship, in which He who supports necessarily stands to him who is supported. So Philippi and others, all taking συνεργεῖ as = βοηθεῖ.—R.]

and peripherical one—that course of all things and all destinies about them which is placed under God's authority and Christ's power, and constitutes their guidance to glorification.

For good, εἰς ἀγαθόν. Strictly, *for good.* The article is wanting, for the Apostle has in mind the antithesis: not for evil, injurious, and destructive working; and because every thing shall be useful to them, and promotive, in a special way, of their good. For the good is, *the promotion of life.* Every good thing of this kind relates, indeed, to the realization of their eternal salvation, but it is not directly this itself (Reiche). [Bengel: *In bonum ad glorificationem usque.*—R.]

Those who love God [τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν τὸν θεόν. Alford: "A stronger designation than any yet used for believers." Comp. 1 Cor ii. 9; Eph. vi. 24; James i. 12.—R.] The Apostle defines this expression more specifically with reference to its purpose, by the addition:

To those who are the called according to his purpose [τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν]. Yet the addition is not designed to furnish a definition for the explanation of the name, *those who love God* (Meyer); nor did the Apostle wish thereby to qualify the preceding clause (Rückert), but to represent more clearly the foundation of the life of those who love God, &c. (Tholuck, Fritzsche, Philippi, and others). The intention or purpose of God is the rock of their salvation, and the same purpose directs all things. The love of believers for God is therefore not the ground of their confidence, but the sign and security that they were first loved by God. But the Apostle uses for this another expression, which indicates as well the evidence as the firmness of the love which has gone out for them. The evidence of their salvation lies in the fact that they are called by God to salvation (in the operative κλῆσις with which the gospel has pervaded their hearts). This evidence refers to the firmness of their salvation in the purpose of God; the genuine κλῆσις of true Christians depends upon the πρόθεσις, and testifies of it. See *Doctr. Notes.**

Vers. 29, 30. In the following grand and glorious exposition, the Apostle represents God's purpose as being unfolded and realized in its single elements. It is developed as the ante-mundane and eternal foundation of the historical order of salvation in the two parts, foreknowing and predestinating, with reference to the eternal limit, the *glory.* It is then historically realized in the saving acts of the calling and the justifying. It is finally completed in the glorifying of believers. The foreknowing proceeds, in truth, from eternity to eternity; the predestinating passes from eternity over into time; and finally, the glorifying passes from time over into post-temporal eternity, while in the calling and justifying the two eternities are linked together, and reveal eternity in time.

For whom he foreknew, he also predestinated [ὅτι οὓς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν]. The twice-repeated πρό comes under the treatment before the examination of the single elements. Tholuck: "According to a later view of Meyer, the πρό expresses only precedence before the call; but it is against the analogy of προγινώσκω in chap. xi. 2; 1 Peter i. 20; and of προορίζω in 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. i. 5, 11." It is certainly clear that the Apostle will here establish the eternal end, the δόξα, upon an eternal beginning (ἀρχή).

First element: **Whom he foreknew.** Tholuck says, that "προγινώσκειν has been explained in *four different* ways, and in such a manner that each of the accepted meanings has its predestinarian as well as its anti-predestinarian advocates." These four definitions are: 1. *To know beforehand;* 2. *To acknowledge beforehand, approbare;* 3. *To select, or choose beforehand;* 4. *To determine beforehand, decernere, prædestinare.*

The *knowing beforehand* was understood by the Greek and Arminian expositors in an anti-predestinarian sense as the foresight of faith; and by the Lutheran exegetical writers as the foresight of perseverance in the bestowed faith. Meyer: Foreknowledge of those destined for salvation. A knowing of the predestinated beforehand, as, according to Tholuck, was accepted by Augustine in later life, and by Zwingli, is very tautological.* But this view passes over, in reality, into a second: *approbavit;* and we then have Tholuck's arrangement, by which eight antitheses—four predestinarian and four anti-predestinarian—must be limited, yet not carried out. The *approbavit* is, indeed, defended in both an Augustinian and an Arminian sense. But, in the former, it coincides with the third view, *elegit* (Calvin, and others). But if the *decernere* is also understood in a predestinarian sense, to determine concerning a person, it is only a stronger expression for the *elegit* in the predestinarian sense. With respect to further treatment of this point, we must refer to the well-known commentaries.

If we turn away from the verbal explanation, there are really but two constructions of this passage, the predestinarian and the anti-predestinarian; in addition to these, there comes at most only the

* [Tholuck: "They are not called merely according to a Divine decree (*nude*), but according to one whose stages are set forth up to the final goal of the ἐδόξασε." Meyer: "The πρόθεσις is the free decree, formed by God in eternity, of saving the believers through Christ (chap. ix. 11; Eph. i. 11; iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9, *al.*). According to this, the *call* of God to the Messianic salvation through the preaching of the gospel (chap. x. 14; 2 Thess. ii. 14) is promulgated to those who are included in that decree. When, therefore, Paul calls the Christians κλητοί, it is self-evident that the call, in their case, meets with success (1 Cor. i. 24), and hence has been united with the converting effect of Divine grace; although this is not found in the *word itself*, which in that case would be equivalent to ἐκλεκτοί. . . . Weiss (*Jahrbücher für D. Theologie*, 1857, p. 79) aptly says: 'Election and calling are inseparable correlative ideas; where one takes place, the other does also; only the former, as a pre-temporal, internally Divine act, cannot be perceived, but the latter, as a historical fact, is made manifest.'" The remarks of Alford *in loco* may well be appended at this point in the exegesis of the Epistle: "It may suffice to say, that, on the one hand, Scripture bears constant testimony to the fact that all believers are chosen and called by God—their whole spiritual life in its origin, progress, and completion, being *from Him;* while, on the other hand, its testimony is no less precise that He willeth all to be saved, and that none shall perish except by wilful rejection of the truth. So that, on the one side, GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY, and, on the other, MAN'S FREE WILL, is plainly declared to us. *To receive, believe, and act on both these,* is our *duty and our wisdom.* They belong, as truths, no less to *natural* than to revealed religion; and every one who believes in a God, must acknowledge both. But all attempts to *bridge over the gulf between the two* are *futile,* in the present imperfect condition of man." See chap. ix. throughout. He who would understand the Epistle to the Romans, must assume this position, and remember that the difficulty belongs to Theism, not to Christianity alone, much less to the Calvinistic conception of it.—R.]

* [Jowett thus avoids the tautology: "*Foreknew*, as the internal purpose of God—if such a figure of speech may be allowed; and *predestined*, as the solemn external act by which He, as it were, set apart His chosen ones." See the view of Dr. Hodge, below.—R.]

germ, or intimation of the possibility, of a third. The predestinarian explanation of the word προγινώσκειν by "to acknowledge," *approbare* (Beza, and others), or by *decernere*, "to determine" (Luther: "ordained," not foreseen), is linguistically untenable; but it is linguistically tenable when explained by *to elect beforehand, to choose* (Calvin, Rückert, De Wette); * and now means predestination as a doctrinal truth, now as a temporary Pauline view, and now, in the most universal sense possible, the general election for salvation (De Wette, and others).

The anti-predestinarian interpretation of the expression is also varied: the *seeing* or *knowing beforehand* of those who are worthy through faith, of those endowed with faith, &c.; and again, in the sense of loving or *approbans* beforehand (Grotius, and others).

As far as a third exposition is concerned, the observation has been made that God's foreknowledge is a *loving* knowledge (see Tholuck, p. 449), or a creative knowledge, a being placed in the idea of Christ (Neander, *Apost. Zeitalter*, p. 822).† Yet Neander's explanation does not go to the bottom of the matter. It is this: "Those whom God, in His eternal view, has *known* as belonging to Him, through Christ, have been predestinated thereto by Him." We are, indeed, in want of a term which definitely expresses the truth that the loving or fixing knowledge is an absolutely original one, which *determines* the idea of the one to be perceived, but does not *predetermine* it.‡ Meyer's reminder, that προγινώσκειν, in the classical sense, never means any thing but foreknowledge, has no weight here, where we have to do with an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον in the centre of the Christian doctrine of salvation. [See Meyer's note.] The one collective Hebrew term for *knowing, loving, being present at,* and *begetting* (Gen. iv. 1), is only a modification of the theocratic thought that God calls by name those who do not yet exist, as if He would be, and in order that He may be, their God (Jer. xxxi. 3; Ps. cxxxix. 9; cxlviii. 6). "To call by name" (Is. xliii. 1) "to grave upon the hands" (Isa. xlix. 16), and similar expressions, denote figuratively the unity of that knowing and loving which *fix in idea* the subject in its peculiarity (certainly in Christ), in order that, in consequence of the idea, they may be called into existence. The distinction of prescience and predestination in the first foundation of the world, is connected with a defective comprehension of the peculiar character of personal life. (See the *Doctr. Notes.*)

Second element: **He also predestinated.** The προορίζειν presupposes God's first determination of man,* which establishes his *individuality* in relation to other individualities, and to Christ, the centre. Here the question is the predetermination of the historical destiny of the individual, the establishment of the historical guidance to salvation, just as all kindred definitions, together with προορίζειν in Acts iv. 28; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. i. 5–11; ἀφορίζειν in Rom. i. 1; Gal. i. 15; and ὁρίζειν in Acts x. 42; xvii. 26 (where we have ὁροθεσία also), are determined by the fundamental thought of the ὅρος, which is the limitation and condition in time and space, that are identical with the destiny in its relation to salvation, the object of man—a relation which reaches its climax in the τάσσειν (Acts xiii. 48). Therefore the Apostle also adds here the destination to conformity to the image of God's Son, undoubtedly with reference to the definite conformity of the historical way of life—through sufferings to glory (chap. vi. 4 ff.; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Heb. ii. 9–11), and to historical confirmation and completion (Phil. ii. 5–11, and elsewhere).

[To be conformed to the image of his Son, συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. The word σύμμορφος is followed by the genitive here; by the dative, Phil. iii. 21. Hence Stuart thinks it is to be taken as a substantive in this case; but Alford remarks that it is like σύμφυτος (chap. vi. 5), in being followed by either. Comp. Kühner, ii. p. 172. It is the accusative of the predicate; see Winer, p. 214.—R.] Evidently, we have to deal here with a specifically new ordination on God's part, though it is in harmony with the previous one. The meaning of μορφή comes into consideration in order to explain more definitely the συμμόρφους (to which we need not supply an εἶναι, because the predestination involves a predescription). Tholuck: "The term μορφή means frequently, but not invariably, the phase of the *human form*, as well as the form in general, and even the μορφὴ ἐπέων (see Plato,

* [So Jowett, Stuart (substantially), and Calvinistic interpreters generally. Dr. Hodge thus presents this view: "It is evident, on the one hand, that πρόγνωσις expresses something more than the prescience of which all men and all events are the objects; and, on the other, something different from the προορισμός (predestination) expressed by the following word: 'whom he foreknew, them he also predestinated.' The predestination follows, and is grounded on the foreknowledge. The foreknowledge, therefore, expresses the act of cognition or recognition—the fixing, so to speak, the mind upon, which involves the idea of selection. If we look over a number of objects with the view of selecting some of them for a definite purpose, the first act is to fix the mind on some, to the neglect of the others; and the second is, to destine them to the proposed end. So God is represented as looking on the fallen mass of men, and fixing on some whom He predestines to salvation. This is the πρόγνωσις, the foreknowledge, of which the Apostle here speaks. It is the knowing, fixing upon, or selecting those who are to be predestinated to be conformed to the image of the Son of God." As little can be gained by a philological discussion of the word, and as theological bias will affect the views of many, it need only be added, that the πρόθεσιν of ver. 28 gives the best clue to the meaning of πρό, in the compounds of this verse; that the words should be as little as possible confused by the introduction of the ideas of approving, loving, &c.; that chap. xi. 2, where προέγνω is used of Israel, most of whom were not saved, does not affect the specific sense here; for there, the matter under discussion is a whole people as a chosen people; here, individuals, who are first of all brought into prominence as personal lovers of God, then as "called according to His purpose;" that the idea of the certainty of salvation is so clearly the main thought of the passage, as to warrant us, where two meanings are presented, in leaning to that which offers the best ground for such security. Hence we adopt the predestinarian view throughout.—R.]

† [This seems to be the view of Wordsworth, and many Anglican divines, who would avoid both Calvinism and Arminianism. Wordsworth is very full, both in his introduction and notes, upon this subject, but lacks clearness.—R.]

‡ [If any thing is gained in clearness by this distinction, it should by all means be accepted, as distinguishing the foreknowledge from the predestination; but many will fail to find more than a verbal difference in the phrases employed.—R.]

* [Alford: "His foreknowledge was not a mere *being previously aware* how a series of events would happen, but was coördinate with, and inseparable from, His having *preordained* all things." That the word means foreordained, predestinated, is certain; that it is here applied to individuals, is obvious; that it implies a preterrestrial act of the Divine mind, is in accordance with the current of thought in the chapter, the scriptural conception of God's purpose, and the use of the word in other passages. It is only one side of the truth, indeed, but the other side is not more firmly established by ignoring this. The only reconciliation of the difficulty is in practical Christian experience, and Paul is addressing himself to this throughout *And we know* (ver. 28).—R.]

Phæd., pp. 103, 104). Aristotle distinguishes εἶδος, the inward forming power; μορφή, the phenomenal form; and ἐνέργεια, its concrete reality, &c., and συμμορφοῦσθαι, from the conformity of appearance or situation."

The further definition, conformably to the image, or conformity of the image, which is still stronger, brings the idea of the phenomenal form still more strongly into the light. Therefore Theodoret, Augustine, Fritzsche, and Meyer, would confine the expression merely to a share in the glorified corporealness of Christ (Phil. iii. 21), or to the δόξα (ver. 10). Meyer and De Wette maintain, contrary to Calvin, Grotius, Calovius, and others, that "*fellowship of suffering* is here remote;" against which view Tholuck observes, that the object is expressed by the subsequent ἐδόξασε. Tholuck, p. 450, says, in speaking of συμμόρφους, "that the grand thought of Christ, as the prototype of all humanity, elevated through sufferings to the δόξα and to the συμβασιλεύειν τῷ θεῷ, occurs in the Scriptures in interchangeable forms; John xii. 26; xvii. 22–24; Rom. viii. 17 (Eph. iv. 13); 2 Tim. ii. 12; 1 John iii. 3; Rev. iii. 21." He also says, on p. 451: "Since mention was made of the sufferings of Christians, many expositors (Calvin, and others) have been led, by reference to Heb. ii. 10, to suppose a conformity to the glory to be obtained through sufferings; but, as Cocceius remarks, this declaration of gradation is justified neither by the expression, nor by the Apostle's purpose." These two statements do not harmonize well. But the predestination of the suffering life, and of the end to be attained, is here a collective idea. The end is *historical* confirmation ("the Lamb that was slain," Rev. v. 12; "these are they which came out of great tribulation," Rev. vii. 14), and the way thither is nothing else than the following of Christ crucified (comp. Heb. ii. 10, 11). A sundering of the two elements thus destroys the specific character of the determination. As doubts in regard to the apparent conformation of believers with Christ himself have been raised into prominence, and attempts have been made to solve them, they will disappear of themselves, if we adhere closely to the idea of the συμμόρφους (see Tholuck, p. 451; Chrysostom: Ὅπερ γὰρ ὁ μονογενὴς ἦν φύσει, τοῦτο καὶ αὐτοὶ γεγόνασι κατὰ χάριν, &c.).

[The word σύμμορφος occurs only here and in Phil. iii. 21, where the reference is to the body of Christ. (The cognate verb is found in Phil. iii. 10, in connection with the death of Christ.) The view which restricts the meaning to the glorified corporealness of Christ (Meyer, De Wette), seems scarcely in keeping with the context. Doubtless this is included. We may then choose between the reference to "that entire form, of *glorification in body* and *sanctification in spirit*, of which Christ is the perfect pattern, and all His people shall be partakers" (Alford; so Philippi); or may extend it also to the present partaking in *sufferings* and *moral character* like His (Stuart, Hodge, Webster and Wilkinson, following Calvin, &c.). There seems to be no objection to this wide reference; in fact, the immediate context rather favors it, but the latter idea (moral character) has perhaps gained too great prominence, in the effort to justify thereby the fact of predestination, as predestination to holiness. The thought of *sufferings* is not so "remote," as, besides being the keynote of the section (ver. 18), it is implied in ver. 28, and recurs in ver. 31, to be the prominent thought throughout the rest of the chapter.—R.]

That he might be the first-born among many brethren. The εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς is, at all events, a clause not merely of result, but of purpose. [The reference in the aorists to the past decree of redemption requires us to take this clause as telic.—R.] According to De Wette, the principal thought is, that He, the first-born, might be *among many brethren;* according to Meyer, that He might be the *first-born* among many brethren. Tholuck: The chief thought is, the share of the ἀδελφοί in the possession of the First-born. The πρωτότοκος (Col. i. 15–17) implies not merely the element of time and rank (Tholuck), but also that of causal priority; and this element cannot be wanting in the present passage.* The expression therefore denotes, according to the prominence given to His conformity with believers, also his elevation above them; but it is an elevation which is in harmony with inward uniformity, a true fraternization.

We do not think it advisable to lay stress on either the *many brethren* or on *the first-born*. The real aim, after all, is Christ (for *him*, Col. i. 16), but Christ as the first-born (not merely the μονογενής of God) among many brethren; therefore the people of His kingdom, a choir of brethren, are to be with Christ, and all around Him. [The end of the foreknowing and predestining is the glorification of Christ in us, His people. The ideas become as inseparable as the glorified brethren themselves are —R.]

Ver. 30. **Them he also called** [τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν]. The καλεῖν, like the κλῆσις, is without suffix, since the idea, prepared by the Old Testament קָהָל, is generally known and elucidated; in addition to this, there is a still greater New Testament fundamental conception. The sense is this: called to the community of Christ as to the communion of salvation, to the Supper of the Lord, to life, &c. But as election comprises a twofold idea, a historical (John vi. 70) and a mystical or transcendental one, so does κλῆσις also comprise a twofold conception (Matt. xxii. 14). Evidently, we have here to deal with the idea of an inward κλῆσις; that is, a κλῆσις become inward from a merely external one. Meyer denies that this κλῆσις relates to the inward operations of grace, but holds that the effects of the call result from the relation of preaching to the existing qualification of men. But such an effect is hardly conceivable without the operation of grace. Tholuck opposes any distinction between a *vocatio externa* and *interna*, between a *vocatio inefficax* and *efficax*. The idea may have been represented one-sidedly by predestinarian theologians; but the fact of the distinction is continually corroborated in every village church where the gospel is preached. We gain no clearer view by the remark, that the spirit of Plato is contained in the Platonic writings, for thousands have not found the Platonic spirit in them. This remark applies only to such spiritualists as, on the one hand, place the "dead" word without the spirit, or, on the other, the spirit without the word. We may enlarge by saying, that if the κλῆσις stands midway between προορίζειν and the δικαιοῦν, the specific idea necessarily becomes apparent. The καλεῖν is that effect of God's word completed in the gospel, which is divided into illu-

* [Comp. Lange's *Comm.*, *Colossians*, p. 21 ff. on πρωτότοκος, where all three ideas are involved, that of time being specially prominent there.—R.]

mination and awakening. It is prepared by the effect of the προορίζειν: *Laboriousness and burdensomeness* (Matt. xi. 28); it unites with these, and, by conversion through penitence and by believing confidence, prepares the δικαίωσις for saving faith.* But, of course, if the question is concerning the κλητοῖς, the κλῆσις also comprises the δικαίωσις, and even the beginnings of the δοξάζειν.—In that case, also the idea of the δικαιοῦν between καλεῖν and δοξάζειν results in the most definite way (see chap. iii.).

[**Them he also justified,** τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν. See the exhaustive notes of Dr. Schaff, pp. 130 ff., 138 ff.—R.]

And whom he justified, them he also glorified [οὓς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν]. The exegetical writers begin here to wonder at the aorist, while their surprise ought to have begun at least with the ἐκάλεσεν. For, at the time when the Apostle wrote these words, only a very few of the whole future body of believers were really called. Therefore the aorist ἐδόξασε cannot stand here for the future (according to Vorstius and Glass), nor for the present (according to Köllner), nor in the sense of taking care of (according to Flatt). Meyer holds that the Apostle here describes the actually certain future glorification as so necessary and certain, that it is the same as if it had already taken place.† Tholuck regards the aorist here as the prophetic preterite. [So Stuart.]

We will now consider more particularly the antithesis which Meyer calls special attention to—that Grotius, and others, have regarded the act of δοξάζειν as having only happened in the purpose of God,‡ but that Chrysostom, and others, on the contrary, have referred the δόξα to the gift of grace in this world. The Apostle's starting-point is evidently *his present time*, the fellowship of the κλητοί and of the δικαιούμενοι in which he stands. This is even literally established, in a certain relation, by the expression, καὶ ἐδόξασεν. For δοξάζειν means not merely to invest one with δόξα at the end of time, but to lead gradually by the πνεῦμα τῆς δόξης (1 Peter iv. 14) to glory. The whole guidance of believers is δοξασμός in the biblical sense. This δοξασμός had therefore already begun for the companions of the Apostle, and, in his believing confidence, it was just as good as completed (see vers. 38, 39).* But if the Apostle had merely wished to describe this standpoint of the Christians of that day—that is, merely the standpoint of experience—he would have had to commence with the οὓς ἐκάλεσεν, and return from the οὓς ἐδικαίωσεν to προώρισεν, and finally to προέγνω. But he has changed the statement of his experience of that period into a doctrinal statement for all time, in order to exhibit the πρόθεσις of God in its full splendor. His sorites has then chiefly a *historical* meaning. Many had already completely passed over this stationed way; for example, Stephen, and James the Elder. In the same manner this way had, and will always have, to many, a *distinguishing* meaning; that is, it applies to the secure developing progress of the elect in a special sense. It has, finally, for all: *a.* a methodological meaning; that is, they experience here the final consequence of God's saving acts in the *ordo salutis; b.* the meaning of evangelical promise. If they stand in the circle of the κλῆσις and δικαίωσις, they can be certain, retrospectively, of their election and foreordination (historical determination), and prospectively certain of their guidance to glory. Paul assumes throughout the ethical facts and conditions that correspond to these acts of God; but he does not name them here, because the connection requires that the superiority of the Divine ground of salvation to human weakness should alone be glorified † (see *Doctr. Notes*).

Ver. 31. **What then shall we say to these things?** [Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα. On τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν, comp. chap. iii. 5; iv. 1; vi. 1; vii. 7; ix. 14, where it introduces a false conclusion; here, and chap. ix. 30, a correct one; De Wette.—R.] Tholuck: "Τί ἐροῦμεν is used here, contrary to the Apostle's custom, in a conclusion which has *not* a doubtful character." But the apparently doubtful element lies in the conclusion which might be drawn, that the Christian can have no opposition. He has, indeed, says Paul, no veritable opposition; all the opposition that he really has, only helps him. What follows from the fact that God has so securely established our salvation through all its stages? ‡ The conclusion is this:

If God is for us, who is against us? [Εἰ ὁ θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τίς καθ' ἡμῶν;] (Ps. xci. 1–7). Every thing which is against us, in

* [As the Apostle is speaking of God's acts, not ours, there is no mention of faith, or any other human exercises, and there need be none; for who can misunderstand him, when this side of the matter is in question? The justice of Dr. Lange's view of "called" is apparent. For the whole verse with remarkable particularity declares that the same persons were predestinated, called, justified, glorified; and to understand by the *calling* only the general invitation to believe and accept the gospel, weakens the force of the passage. Besides, it is *not true* that those whom God invites to believe through the gospel, He justifies also, and glorifies. To admit this, is to obliterate the distinction between the wayside and fruitful hearers (Matt. xiii. 18–23)—to fly in the face of fact, as well as the plain teaching of the Word of God. Dr. Hodge, and Calvinistic interpreters generally, make "called" = effectually called. Undoubtedly the call is effectual, linked inseparably with predestination and justification; but since the technical meaning of effectual calling is really regeneration, we may hesitate in giving to the word here used a force so extended. The subjective aspect of effectual calling is not introduced, at all events, we have only the order of the *Divine acts* respecting the salvation of individuals, as presenting the *objective* certainty of that salvation.—R.]

† [So Philippi, De Wette. Alford combines with it that of Grotius, much as Dr. Lange does: "The aorist ἐδόξασεν being used, as the other aorists, to imply the completion in the *Divine counsel* of all these, which are to us, in the state of time, so many successive steps—simultaneously and irrevocably."—R.]

‡ [Dr. Hodge adopts a modification of this view, though he suggests that the aorist may imply frequency, almost = the present. Neither of these seem so satisfactory as that of Meyer, or that of Lange himself.—R.]

* [The omission of "them he also sanctified," which we would expect to find in the chain, were "glorified" limited to the future, is a sufficient ground for this position of Dr. Lange, and favors also the view, that the certainty is prominent, rather than the completion of all these in the purpose of God. Of course, the objective certainty rests on this completion in God's purpose, but the latter is included only by implication.—R.]

† [As the whole passage can only be of encouragement when viewed in this light, Wordsworth deprives it of its force entirely, when he says that the Church of England teaches: "She considers these things as *done;* for in God's will, and, on *His side*, they *are* done, for all members of the visible Church of Christ;" and then makes the whole matter so dependent on us, "that, unless we perform our part, all God's gracious purposes toward us will fail of their effect." See his lengthy notes, which touch (scarcely grapple) this difficult subject.—R.]

‡ [Meyer takes vers. 31–39 as a conclusion from vers. 29, 30; "The Christian has, then, nothing to fear that can be detrimental to his salvation, but he is, with the love of God in Christ, certain of this salvation." This whole passage (notice the logical relation of ὅτι, ver. 29, and οὖν, ver. 31,) is a commentary on ver. 28;—and what a commentary!—R.]

an earthly sense, must, in a heavenly sense, promote our welfare through God's sovereignty. [How God is for us, has been set forth; the question therefore implies, not doubt, but joyous certainty. Hence the E. V. is not strong enough.—R.] This confidence of the Apostle, in opposition to the hostile forces of the world, assumes a bold and almost challenging tone. Tholuck: "There begins with this expression a series of victorious questions and triumphant answers, in reference to which Erasmus exclaims: '*Quid unquam Cicero dixit grandiloquentius?*' Just such a triumphant acclamation is found in 1 Cor. xv. 54."

[Philippi: "In fact, as vers. 19–23 may be called a sacred elegy, so we may term vers. 31–39 a sacred ode; that is as tender and fervent as this is bold and exalted in matter and in manner; that, an amplification of 'we do groan, being burdened' (2 Cor. v. 4); this, a commentary on 'this is the victory that overcometh the world' (1 John v. 4). Augustine, *De doctr. christi*, iv. 20, cites ver. 31 as an example of the *grande dicendi genus, quod non tam verborum ornatibus cerutum est, quam violentum animi affectibus.—Satis enim est si propter quod agitur, ut verba congruentia, non oris eligantur industria, sed pectoris sequantur ardorem. Nam si aurato gemmatoque ferro vir fortis armetur, intentissimus pugnæ, agit quidem illis armis quod agit, non quia pretiosa, sed quia arma sunt.*" —R.]

Ver. 32. **He who spared not his own Son** [ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο. Meyer, and others, take this as an interrogative answer to the preceding question. It does indeed answer it, but is, at the same time, an advance (see below). The enclitic γε has the force of *even, quippe qui*, but Alford is not justified in saying that this takes "one act as a notable example out of all;" for this is the crowning proof of love, including all the others, and hence establishing the main clause: *how shall he not*, &c.—R.] After the Apostle has described negatively, in ver. 31, the elevation of God's children above the hostile world, he portrays it positively in ver. 32. The logical construction is as follows: God, who has already established our δόξα, is for us, with the whole energy of His purpose. *a.* He is for us in person as our protector, and therefore no person and no thing can be against us; *b.* He is for us to such a degree that He gave His Son* for us. Οὐκ ἐφείσατο involves here two ideas: He did not *save* Him (Bengel: *paterno suo amori quasi vim adhibuit*), and, He did not *spare* Him.

But delivered him up for us all [ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν. On the verb, comp. chap. iv. 25. On the preposition ὑπέρ, *in behalf of*, comp. chap. v. 6.—R.]. Deliverance to death for us, for our redemption.† The notion which would explain John iii. 16 as a "deliverance to finiteness" (mentioned by Tholuck on p. 455), belongs rather to the philosophy of Schelling in his early period, than to the christological standpoint.

[Freely give us all things? τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίσεται; A question *a majori ad minus* (Meyer). Philippi and Meyer join καί with πῶς οὐχί, not with σὺν αὐτῷ. It is perhaps more grammatical, but the thought is still the same: that with Christ, and because of Christ, all else shall come.—R.] Τὰ πάντα. Tholuck: "Every thing which we need." This is against Brenz, who explains thus: "All the blessings comprised in Christ." But why not simply, *every thing*, in harmony with ver. 17 and 1 Cor. iii. 22? For, after all, we "need" every thing, and the "blessings comprised in Christ" are the whole universe. Therefore the σύν is not merely based on the idea of the προςθήκη.

Vers. 33–35. Two lines of the certainty of salvation have been drawn from the one fundamental idea of the κλῆσις κατὰ πρόθεσιν; that is, of the *assurance of salvation.* There is, first, the line of the certainty of individual, inward, and personal salvation (vers. 28, 30); the *causa principalis:* grace. Then we have, second, the line of historical salvation, which corresponds with the first line as the *causa mediatrix.* This latter appears as the almighty gift of salvation, in opposition to the contradiction of the world. As the Apostle looks at the fearful appearance of this contradiction, he now presents throughout the negative character of the historical salvation. That is, he develops the thought placed at the outset—that nothing can be against us, because God is for us; so very much for us, that He delivered even His Son for us. But the Apostle then brings out the fact, though more indirectly, that God will, with Him, also freely give us all things. Thus there is, first of all, the exalted mediation of salvation. "Who shall *lay any thing to the charge* of God's elect?"

Different constructions of the following three verses (vers. 33–35):

a. Vers. 33 and 34 are antitheses which must be read as question and answer, according to our translation. [So E. V.] (See Luther, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Fritzsche, Philippi [Stuart, Hodge], and others.)

b. The three answers also stand in the form of questions, thus: Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? Will God, who justifieth, do it? Who is He that condemneth? Will Christ, who died for us, do it? (This is the view of Augustine, Ambrose, Koppe, Reiche, Olshausen, De Wette [Alford, Webster and Wilkinson, Jowett], and others.)

c. An altered form of presenting the antitheses: 1. Who shall lay any thing to the charge? Answer: It is God that justifieth; who, therefore, is He that condemneth? 2. Answer: It is Christ that died, &c., who also maketh intercession for us; who, therefore, shall separate us from the love of Christ? This construction of the antithesis, which was laid down by Origen, Chrysostom, and Theodoret, has been neglected by nearly all recent expositors, but is urgently recommended by Meyer. [Wordsworth follows it in his text, but is impressively silent on the subject in his notes. See Meyer, not only in defence of his own view, but for a *resumé* of other opinions.—R.]

Tholuck very properly remarks, in opposition to

* [*His own Son.* Tholuck, Olshausen, Philippi, Stuart, Hodge, and many others, find an implied antithesis here, viz., his adopted sons (ver. 19, &c.), to which Meyer and De Wette object. At all events, the emphasis resting on ἰδίου requires us to understand it as son in a *specific* sense, μονογενής. The christological bearing of the passage is unmistakable.—R.]

† [Most commentators admit the special reference to death. It is not necessary to restrict it to this, but the thought is certainly prominent in Paul's expressions concerning Christ.—*Us all*, evidently means believers here. The value or the efficacy of the atonement is not brought into view at all. To this commentators of all doctrinal tendencies agree.—R.]

this third combination of sentences, as follows: "It can be least satisfactory of all; for, if we adopt it, that rhetorical conformity of the sentences is lost which is apparent in the other constructions," &c. But this construction not merely obliterates the grand simplicity of the antitheses, but also obscures their real order. The question, Who shall lay any thing to the charge? remains totally unanswered. But, on the contrary, the question, Who is He that condemneth? would receive two answers: first, the expression, "it is God that justifieth," and afterward, "it is Christ that died," &c. In addition to this, the clear thoughts, *justification*, in ver. 33, the *atonement*, in ver. 34, and *holiness or glorification*, in vers. 35–37, would be totally confused.

The second construction appears to be favored by the fact, that the third question, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" seems, in turn, to be answered by a rhetorical question (tribulation, or distress, &c.?). But the third question is continued through vers. 35 and 36, and the answer to it follows in a positive declaration in ver. 37.

Thus elegance of both form and matter pronounces in favor of the antithesis of three questions and three answers. If it be objected, that the answers would be still strengthened by the form of rhetorical questions, we might reply, that they would indeed be strengthened even to overstraining and obscurity. For there are, indeed, accusers and condemners enough against believers, which is plain from what follows: tribulation, distress, persecution, &c. But the principal thing is, that they stand as accusers against the justifying God himself, and as condemners of the future Judge of the world, Christ the Messiah, who is the Saviour of believers; and therefore, that their charge and condemnation are not only impotent, but must even advance the glory of believers, just as tribulation, distress, persecution, &c., are not only unable to separate them from the love of Christ, but must establish them in His love as decided victors. But Paul could hardly have expressed, even in the form of a rhetorical question, the thought that God could be the accuser of believers, and Christ could be their condemner, even if we consider the question apart from the fact that he would thereby have destroyed the antithesis: if God be for us, who can be against us? Meyer remarks, against the former construction, that θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν and τίς ὁ κατακρίνων would be essentially correlative. This is altogether incorrect. The δικαίωσις removes the *charge* of condemnation; the atonement made by Christ abolishes the condemnation itself. That Paul did not write τίς κατακρινεῖ to correspond with the τίς ἐγκαλέσει, is not only unimportant, but is based upon the supposition that there could be many accusers, but that there could be only one condemner at the tribunal. Meyer holds that, by the first construction, Christ must have been represented as Judge, in harmony with the ὁ κατακρίνων in ver. 34. But apart from the consideration that Christ opposes all the worldly condemnations of men pronounced on unbelievers, by interceding for them at God's right hand, we hold that the reading Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς (the Sinaiticus favors the same), which seems to have been early given up from a misconception, serves as a satisfactory explanation. As, therefore, the first sentence is: *God* is the justifier, the second is this: Christ the Messiah, the expected Judge of the world, is Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀποθανών. The article before Ἰησοῦς is given with the adjective designations.* Tholuck has declined to decide concerning the punctuation.

[The pointing adopted in the E. V. has been so fully defended by Dr. Lange, that the following remarks will suffice in addition. (1.) Even the most rhetorical style would scarcely indulge in seventeen successive questions, without an answer, as view *b.* would maintain. (2.) View *c.* disturbs the flow of the passage, without adding to this force. (3.) The grand thought of the certainty of salvation seems to be even more fully established by accepting three questions and three answers following each in turn, while there is no reasonable objection to the correspondence thus claimed between each question and its answer.—R.]

Ver. 33. **Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?** [τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ; The verb is usually followed by the dative, only here with κατά. The article is omitted with ἐκλεκτῶν, giving prominence to the attribute of the persons (Meyer). That it refers to the persons under discussion throughout, is obvious.—R.] The idea of the ἐκλέγεσθαι theocratically resting on the Old Testament בָּחַר, corresponds with that of the προγινώσκειν; but in the concrete name of the ἐκλεκτοί, it denotes the deepest establishment of the whole character of believers in the εὐδοκία of God (see *Doctr. Notes*).

It is God that justifieth! [θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν! The expression is more energetic than θεὸς δικαιοῖ; comp. Matt. x. 20 (Philippi). The θεός, occurring immediately after θεοῦ, has a rhetorical emphasis (Meyer).—R.] According to Tholuck, the question really is the *intercessor* in opposition to the charge, and, on the other hand, the δικαιοῦν in opposition to the κατακρίνειν. But this would not correspond with the connection. As the authorized accusers, the law and the conscience, are silenced in the δικαίωσις, which God himself executes, we must here have in mind principally the weakness of the unauthorized accusers, at whose head stands Satan, κατήγορος (Origen), who opposes Christians not only in heathen adversaries (Photius, Theophylact, Grotius), but also in Jewish adversaries. The δικαιοῦν has evidently here also a forensic meaning. Tholuck: "Luther excellently says, in harmony with the sense, 'God is here.'"

Ver. 34. **Who is he that condemneth?** The ὁ κατακρίνων declares, that in an authorized form there can only be one, the Messiah, but it is just He who is their propitiator and intercessor.

It is Christ, &c. [Χριστὸς ἀποθανών, κ.τ.λ.] The Apostle expresses complete deliverance from condemnation in four essential elements of Christ's redeeming work. In the two elements of His death and resurrection there is comprised full deliverance from the real guilt of condemnation (see chap. iv. 25); and in His sitting at the right hand of God, and in His intercession, there is comprised

* [As remarked in *Textual Note* [16], this view is doubly doubtful. The reading is quite uncertain, and to render Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, *Christ is Jesus*, is almost fanciful. Dr. Lange's remark that the article (which might have been expected before Ἰησοῦς, were this the meaning) is found in the attributive clause (ὁ ἀποθανών), will not meet the grammatical objection. So forced a construction would be admissible only in the absence of any other satisfactory explanation. Certainly the thought that the slain yet risen Christ shall judge the world, that our Intercessor is really the only Condemner, is not so unscriptural or unpauline as to create a difficulty from which we must escape by this singular exegesis.—R.]

His protection against the unauthorized accusers from without, and the condemnatory results of the injury of the new life from within.—Meyer: "μᾶλλον δὲ καί,* a higher degree of importance: *immo adeo*. The ὅς καί has a somewhat festive sound."

Ver. 35. **Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?** [τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ;] The reading τοῦ θεοῦ is but weakly supported. Meyer, with Tholuck, De Wette, Philippi, and others, properly says in favor of the construction Χριστοῦ, that it is the genitive subjective; and, therefore, that it denotes Christ's love toward His followers (see vers. 37, 39). But when he says that this forbids the interpretation of others who understand it to be love for Christ (Origen, Köllner [see Forbes, p. 332, on this view], and others), his remark is only correct in form; for, in reality, confidence in love on Christ's part for His children cannot be separated from love for Him (see ver. 28).† The afflictions which now follow are personified by τίς [instead of τί, which we might expect].

But how is the possibility of this separation to be regarded? Meyer: A possible sundering of men from the influx of Christ's love by intervening hindrances. De Wette: The joyous sense of being beloved by Christ. Philippi: Afflictions can seem to us to be an indication of Divine wrath, and thus mislead us into unbelief in Divine love. Tholuck: The firmness of the consciousness of this Divine relation of love. The sense of the question is this: Can an affliction lead us to fall from the operation and experience of Christ's love? By answering in the negative, there is assumed not merely the Divine purpose of grace according to the predestinarian view, and also not merely the purity and perseverance of faith according to the Arminian view, but the connection between the two, the new bond which is secured by the recognition of tribulation, distress, &c., as powers overcome by Christ, and made serviceable to His love itself.

Shall tribulation, &c. [θλῖψις, κ.τ.λ.] The forms of affliction are in harmony with the relations of Christians at that time, and especially of the Apostle; there is the apparently fearful number seven, but the seventh leads to the triumphant conclusion in martyrdom. First of all, believers are pressed into anxiety by the world. [On θλῖψις and στενοχωρία, see ii. 9, p. 99, the former external, the latter internal.—R.] Then there comes **persecution** itself, which drives them out to **famine** and **nakedness**; the end is **peril**, the danger of death, and **sword**, death itself.

Ver. 36. **As it is written** [καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι. Ὅτι is the usual quotation-mark.] Psalm xliv. 22, according to the Septuagint.* This Psalm contains a description of the sufferings which God's people had to suffer for the Lord's sake, and is therefore correctly regarded by Paul as a *typical* and prophetical prelude to the sufferings of the New Testament people of God for God's sake. De Wette does not regard the passage as a prophecy (Tholuck),† but thinks that Paul probably cites it as prophecy. But even Tholuck's expression, "a real parallel to the conflicts of God's ancient people," is by no means sufficient for the idea of typical prophecy, for the type is much more than a parallel.

Ver. 37. **Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors** [ἀλλ' ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν, κ.τ.λ. Some connect this with ver. 35, and hence ver. 36 has been made parenthetical; but there is no necessity for this, since the course of thought is unbroken, and this verse is antithetical to both vers. 35 and 36.—R.] That is, far beyond the necessary measure (ὑπερνικῶμεν). Recollection of prayers for persecutors (Stephen), hymns of praise in prison (Paul and Silas), and the joyous spirit of the martyrs.

Through him who loved us [διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς. See *Textual Note* [18].] Meyer refers the aorist to "the distinguished act of love which Christ has performed by the offering of His own life." Though this reference is undoubtedly correct, there is something inadequate in the translation, *loved*. The aorist ἐπίστευσαν does not merely affirm that they believed, but that they became believers (see John x. 42); and thus the act of our Lord's only revelation of love also involves here the continuation of that relation: who has proved and bestowed His love.—*Through him*. The reading διὰ τόν (Semler, Koppe: *propter*) is a smoother exegetical interpretation.‡ Chrysostom, Theodoret, Bengel, and Fritzsche, refer the expression ἀγαπήσας to God: but on account of ver. 39, Rückert, De Wette, Tholuck, Meyer, and Philippi, on the contrary, refer it to Christ. This latter view is favored by the relation of the present passage to τοῦ Χριστοῦ in ver. 35, as the aorist serves as an intimation of the historical fact of redemption. The expression, "through Him that loved us," denotes not only Christ's assistance in general, but the power of His victory. As His death is principially our death, and His resurrection is our resurrection, so is His victory also our victory through faith (1 John v. 4). But the power of this victory is divided into the subjective principle of victory in the heart of believers, and the objective victorious principle of Christ's rule at the right hand of God. Nevertheless, the Apostle does not say, "through Him who hath conquered for us," because Christ's love shall be manifested as the permanent motive of the free and ethical loving life of Christians in their faith.

* [See *Textual Note* [17]. The καί before ἐστιν is also omitted in ℵ[1]. A. C., but inserted in the majority of MSS. —R.]

† [Calvin adds a third meaning: *our sense of Christ's love to us*. This is implied in the excellent remarks of Dr. Hodge: "The great difficulty with many Christians is, that they cannot persuade themselves that Christ (or God) loves them; and the reason why they cannot feel confident of the love of God, is, that they know they do not deserve His love; on the contrary, that they are in the highest degree unlovely. But it is the very thing we are required to believe, not only as the condition of peace and hope, but as the condition of salvation. If our hope of God's mercy and love is founded on our own goodness or attractiveness, it is a false hope. We must believe that His love is gratuitous, mysterious, without any known or conceivable cause, certainly without the cause of loveliness in its object." —R.]

* [In the LXX., Ps. xliii. 23. The only variation is ἕνεκεν here, on the authority of ℵ. A. B. D. F. L., while (*Rec.*) C. K. have ἕνεκα. It must be remarked, however, that the reading of the LXX. itself varies in the same manner.—R.]

† [So Alford: "'It is no new trials to which we are subjected: what if we verify the ancient description?'" —R.]

‡ [This would refer to Him as the efficient cause; but since the context clearly upholds the reference to Christ, it scarcely seems a "smoother exegetical interpretation" than that which presents Him as the instrumental cause. It represents the union in victory as more intimate to follow the better supported reading, διὰ τοῦ ἀγ.—R.]

THIRD PARAGRAPH, VERS. 38, 39.

Tholuck: "*Ἔνθεος γενόμενος*, as Chrysostom says, embraces the whole world—who can rob him of his consciousness of the love of God?" But he has here passed beyond the consciousness of opposition whch he had uttered in vers. 33–35. He ather proclaims here the absolute subjection of all the powers of the world to the consciousness, or rather conscious being, of God's love in Christ.

The Apostle declares the immovableness of his confidence, first of all by the decided *πέπεισμαι*, **I am persuaded.** He follows this up by portraying the powers of the world in great antitheses, which not only describe the victorious career of the individual Apostle through the world and through time, but, in prophetic sublimity, comprise the whole victorious career of God's people until the end of the world.

Tholuck distinguishes the antitheses thus: 1. Human events (death and life); 2. Superhuman spheres (angels, principalities; afterwards *δυνάμεις*); 3. Time (things present, things to come), in which he thinks that the *δυνάμεις* belonging here, according to A. B. C., &c., disturbs the sense; 4. Space (height and depth). The more general form of this description in relation to the oppositions represented above, appears especially in the fact that here the question is evidently not merely concerning threatening or hostile powers, but also such as can exert a seductive, misleading, and relaxing influence. Accordingly, we have not merely to regard an objective influence of these forces, but also the possibility of the subjective misconstruction of their operations.

Neither death, nor life, [*οὔτε θάνατος, οὔτε ζωή*]. If we look closely at the possibilities above referred to, we shall see that, first of all, with death there is connected the fear of death and the darkness of the kingdom of death; and, with life, that there is connected the charm of life and the love of life, or even the apparent distance from the Lord (Heb. ii. 14; John xvi. 33; 2 Cor. v. 5, 6). On death and life, see chap. xiv. 8. Grotius: *metus mortis, spes vitæ*, which Meyer objects to; but his objection to Koppe's interpretation, which is as follows, is more appropriate: *quidquid est in rerum natura: aut vivat, aut vita careat.*

Nor angels, nor principalities, [*οὔτε ἄγγελοι, οὔτε ἀρχαί*. See *Textual Note* [19], and below.] As far as the *second category* is concerned, the Apostle could not think that God's angels should desire to separate him from the love of Christ, but, according to Col. ii., the Gnostic Jews soon opposed a morbid adoration of angels to a pure and full resignation to Christ as their head; and even Pharisaic Jewish Christians would have been quite capable of adulterating the pure gospel, according to Gal. i. 8, by an appeal to angelic revelation. But it is well known how the subsequent worship of angels really led to an obscuring of the sun of Christ's love.

The threat of the powers of the Gentile world then takes its place beside the Jewish angelic visions. It is plain enough that the *ἀρχαί* named with the *ἄγγελοι* cannot again mean "angelic powers" (Meyer). The Apostle had to deal more and more with the powers of the Gentile world (2 Tim. iv. 17). The *ἄγγελοι* are interpreted by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Beza, Meyer, and others, as *good* angels, "because the evil angels are never called *ἄγγελοι* without some qualifying expression." Meyer opposes the objection of Reiche, and others, that good angels could not make such an attempt to separate Christians from God, by saying that Paul, in Gal. i. 8, did not believe this possibility, but only presented it hypothetically. According to Clement of Alexandria, Grotius [Stuart], and others, the *ἄγγελοι* denote *evil* angels; but according to Bucer, Bengel [Hodge], and others, *good and evil* angels. Melanchthon has interpreted the *ἀρχαί* as human tyrants, because he correctly saw that they, being placed beside *ἄγγελοι*, could not themselves be angels.

[The difficulty in deciding the meaning of the word *ἀρχαί* arises from the fact that it is used in the New Testament in all the senses given above. The prevailing reference is undoubtedly to super human creatures (Eph. iii. 10; vi. 12; Col. i. 16; ii. 10, 15). It seems more natural to take *δυνάμεις* (in its separate position) as "earthly powers," especially as that meaning here gives an anti-climax. The disposition to insert *δυνάμεις* immediately after, shows that a classification of angels was assumed here (comp. Eph. i. 21; Col. i. 16). Whether we should understand good angels, or bad, or both, is more difficult to determine. To take "angels" as referring to the former, and "principalities" to the latter, gives an abrupt antithesis; to refer both to good angels, leaves evil spirits out of view in this extended catalogue, unless we find them named in *δυνάμεις*; to refer both words to both classes (Bengel, Hodge), is perhaps least objectionable, yet with this view the absence of any attribute is remarkable. Still, we infer from other passages that both good and bad angels were classified somewhat in this manner, *ἀρχαί* denoting a superior order. Comp. Lange's *Comm.*, *Colossians*, i. 16, p. 22.—R.]

The *δυνάμεις*, which Melanchthon interprets as the warlike hosts of tyrants, do not belong here, and therefore still less in the category of angels. They belong in the *third category:* **Nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers** [*οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα, οὔτε μέλλοντα,* οὔτε δυνάμεις*]. (See 1 Cor. iii. 22.) The present time was so grievous to Paul and the believers of his period, that they earnestly longed for the second coming of our Lord (1 Thess.); but even the future had a gloomy aspect, for our Lord's coming was to be preceded by the apostasy, and by the appearance of Antichrist (2 Thess. ii.). But with this appearance there were to come just these gloomy, seductive, and Satanic forces (*ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ σημείοις καὶ τέρασι ψεύδους*). We thereby hold that Tholuck's objection, that the *δυνάμεις*† would here "disturb the sense in a *threefold* way," is removed (p. 463). The one objection, that it would disturb the bipartite rhythm, is removed by Meyer's observation, that the Apostle first arranges *by couples*, and then combines the three parts twice more. According to Tholuck, the *δυνάμεις* would be first

* [Here the generic idea of *time* is evidently the prominent one. So Philippi, and most. Alford: "no vicissitudes of *time*."—R.]

† [Meyer takes *δυνάμεις* in its widest sense: powers of every kind. Undoubtedly, if the order of *Rec.* could be adopted, a difficulty would be avoided. (Dr. Hodge takes no notice of the correct reading.) It seems strange that the evil forces should be introduced here. The simplest solution, to my mind, is that which refers this word to *earthly* powers, since it is connected with "things present, things to come." This is still more probable, if "angels" and "principalities" be taken as including all superhuman created beings.—R.]

introduced, and then removed. Meyer urges that ἐνεστ. does not mean things present, but *things standing before*—those which are about to enter. Thus things *present* are distinguished from things to come. De Wette opposes to Glöckler's interpretation of δυνάμεις as miracles, that of *powers*.

Fourth category: **[Nor height, nor depth, οὔτε ὕψωμα, οὔτε βάθος.]** The Apostle looks down from the height of an inspired sense of life, many times elevated to heaven (2 Cor. xii. 2), which could well have become to him a temptation (2 Cor. xii. 7), into the depth of the demoniacal kingdom, with which he had to fight a spiritual conflict with his contemporaries (Eph. vi. 12), as well as into the depth of the realm of the dead in which he had, at all events, to pass through a painful unclothing (2 Cor. v. 4); but he saw in the future altogether new forms of the world arise, whose strangeness and splendor, by their attractiveness, could be regarded as dissipating his view from Christ, the centre.

Tholuck: "ὕψωμα, βάθος. Explanations: Heaven and hell (Theodoret, and others; Bengel, Baumgarten-Crusius); heaven and earth (Theophylact, Fritzsche); happiness and unhappiness (Koppe); honor and shame (Grotius); lofty and lowly (Olearius); higher and lower evil spirits (Origen). *Sapientia hæreticorum et communes vulgi furores* (Melanchthon)." [The generic idea here is that of space. If a more specific definition is required, *heaven and hell* is the simplest explanation, though this cannot be insisted on as the precise meaning.—R.]

Nor any other created thing. In connection with the great antithesis of height and depth, the κτίσις ἑτέρα can hardly mean merely "any thing else created" (Meyer), or a creature in general (Luther, Tholuck).

Shall be able . . . love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. The love of God in Christ, or Christ himself, is now perceived by believers as the all-prevailing principle, and is therefore spiritually appropriated by them (Eph. i.).—The absolute δύναμις is for them also in the ethical sense. It is the completed revelation of the love of God in Christ, overcoming the world and bringing it into their service, by which believers are embraced, and which they in turn have embraced (chap. v. 8).

[Alford: "God's love to us in Christ; to us, as we are in Christ; to us, manifested in and by Christ." Stuart thus sums up: "This is indeed 'an anchor sure and steadfast, entering into that within the vail;'—*a blessed, cheering, glorious hope, which only the gospel and atoning blood can inspire.*"—On the parallelism between chaps. v. and viii., see Forbes, pp. 338 ff.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

First Paragraph, vers. 18-27.

A. *The groaning of the creature** (vers. 18–22).

1. The Scriptures ascribe to the whole universe, even to the heavenly regions, the necessity of the renewal of created being by transformation (Ps. cii. 26–28; Isa. li. 6; Rev. xxi. 5); but they distinguish between the regions of glory, which are renewed, and the present form of the world, which must be renewed by passing through corruption and the destruction of the world (2 Peter iii. 10, 23). The throne of God, the ascension of Christ. Even astronomy recognizes this great contrast between the regions of prevalent growth and of prevalent completed existence in the nature of light (see my work, *Das Land der Herrlichkeit*, pp. 42 ff.). But also in reference to the sphere of humanity, which does not embrace merely the earth (also Sheol), we must distinguish between the pure condition of nature in its antithesis to perfection (1 Cor. xv. 47 ff.), and the obscurity which nature has experienced in consequence of sin; see the present passage. According to the nature of the ἄνθρωπος χοϊκός, his whole sphere stood in need of development—in need of a metamorphosis (2 Cor. v. 1 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 50); but this development has become abnormal through sin; and the metamorphosis has, by a metastasis, become death in the pregnant sense, φθορά, *corruption*. But from this correspondence of nature with the human world in the *state* of fall and decay, there also follows an expectation of their correspondence in the delivering restoration which will be also the completion of the normal development.

2. The Holy Scriptures everywhere render prominent the coherence and correspondence between the spiritual and natural world. There must be a heaven, because there are heavenly objects—because there is a God—because there are angels and saints. There must be a hell, because there are devils. Thus Paradise corresponded with Adam in his state of innocence; the cursed ground, with fallen man; the Promised Land, as the type of the future Paradise, with the typical people of God; a darkening and desolation of the land with every religious and moral decline of the people (Deut. xxviii. 15 ff.; Isa. xxiv. 17; Joel ii.; Zeph. i. 14, &c.), and with every spiritual period of salvation an exaltation of nature (Deut. xxviii. 8 ff.; Ps. lxxii.; Isa. xxv. 6 ff.; Isa. xxxv.; Hosea ii. 21, &c.); and thus the sun was darkened at the death of Christ, and the renewal of the earth was announced by the earthquake at His death. Now this parallelism extends in a more intense degree through the New Testament period, both as to the overthrow of the old form of the world, and the sufferings preceding it (Luke xvi. 25; 2 Peter iii. 10; Rev. xvi. 1 ff.), and as to the renewal succeeding it (Isa. xi. 6; Rev. xx.–xxii.).

3. It corresponds to the connection of the impersonal creature-world with the personal life of man, that the former participates in the anxious expectation of believing humanity for perfection. As nature in *space* aspired beyond itself, in so far as it received the impress of man's nature, so also does it aspire, even in time, beyond itself, in so far as it shares with man his progress toward the change or transformation into the super-terrestrial and glorified form. The waiting of the creature for that perfection, as with erect head, just as it is with the human outlook, may be called prosopopœia; the fundamental thought itself, namely, its suffering, its sense of the impulse toward development—an impulse confined and disturbed by the abnormal condition—is a real relation, an actual course of conduct. We do not include herein the normal forms of death in the brute world. The fundamental idea of this appearance of death is no selfish struggle for existence, but the idea of sacrificing love. The weaker beast

* [This subject has been a special study with Dr. Lange. His notes, which are as profound as they are exhaustive, are left without additions, since to add would be to mar the unity.—R.]

which becomes a prey to the stronger, cannot and should not voluntarily offer itself upon the altar of life, even though it be only a beast; but when the beast in a torpid state pays to the stronger, as though in a dream, its tribute for the joy of its existence, there is reflected the voluntary deliverance to death in a higher region. The most apparent phenomena of the sufferings of the creature, next to the innumerable sufferings of human nature in subjection to diseases, wars, battles, pestilences, are the sufferings of the brute world as they appear to be immersed in the fate of the human world, and are represented in the noblest form in the sacrifice of the brute, and in the grossest form in the pangs of the brute. Yet not only over the brute world, but also over the whole realm of vegetable life, there has extended, with the morbid tendency of the human centre of the world, a morbid development of the most subordinate forms, such as we find in parasites and dwarfs, together with the rapid increase of the common and lowest forms above the more noble, and, in fact, an increase of degenerations of all kinds. But the apostolical, as well as the modern Christian and humane apprehension of nature, extends still beyond the perception of the real groaning of brutes and the degeneration of vegetable life. The sense of the most profound life perceives a groaning of the creature in the most general sense, first, as a longing, developing impulse of the creature-world toward perfection and to the second higher form of existence, and secondly, as a painful suffering under the law of an abnormal and more intense corruptibleness, and thirdly, as a mournful concert, a harmony of all the keynotes of the κόσμος in its homesickness for a new paradise. These keynotes were heard by the prophets (see No. 2, above); Christ has definitely characterized them in His eschatological discourse (Matt. xxv. 29, and the parallels in Mark and Luke); and Paul sketches them here in brief outline, while the Book of Revelation speaks of them in great figures. Through all the periods of the Church there extends a profound sense of this earnest connection between the moral and physical decline of the human world, and we notice its reëcho in the voices of the poets (Shakespeare, for example), down to the Romanticists of recent date (Fr. von Schlegel, Bettina). But in the department of the most recent literature, in which the sense of this anxious expectation and sadness is blunted, there has arisen on the side of the degenerating extreme a fantastical and gloomy view of the "battle for existence," and it would not be surprising if even this materialism should, in turn, degenerate into dualism. Moreover, the expectation of the last catastrophe refers back to the catastrophes underlying the creation of the world, and whose reflection in the Deluge is still proved by our recollection of the most remote antiquity.

4. The Apostle has described the δόξα in 1 Cor. xv. 54 as ἀφθαρσία. Peter speaks of an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away (chap. i. 4). Here the δόξα means, on the one hand, the deliverance of the body, and, on the other, the freedom of God's children. The body, therefore, in its new form, shall be exempted from the natural necessity of physical life; for, as the real body, it has put off, at death, the old bodily form with its sinful propensities. In this life it has become in many ways, a source of temptation and hindrance to the inward life; but in its higher form it shall become the perfect outward expression of the inward life. To be wholly adapted to the spirit, and therefore not only exempt from the corruption, but also the constraint of nature, and to be wholly an organ, an expression, and an image of the spirit —these are the individual characteristics of the glorification in which nature also shall participate, since it is rendered free to share in the freedom of the glory of God's children. In general, the conception of *real* ideality is the object to which they shall be raised; that is, an ideality in which its idea shall not only be delivered from all deformity, but shall even be elevated above the symbolism of the beautiful splendor in which poetry involuntarily becomes prophecy, into the real nature of the beautiful appearance. We shall find an analogue to the representation of the new form of things, if we compare the present form of the earth and of the creature-world with the rough forms of the earth and the gross forms of the creature, which, according to the testimony of paleontology, have preceded the present form of our cosmos (see my *Land der Herrlichkeit; Vermischte Schriften*, vol. ii.).

5. The different eschatologies of antiquity here come in for consideration. As for the relation of the Persian to the Jewish eschatology, it seems, after all, demonstrable that the originality of the theocratic eschatology is reflected in Parsism (Vendidad, Bundehesh), just as the Christian eschatology is reflected in the old German Edda. On the development of the Old Testament eschatology, see Tholuck, note on p. 422; Ps. lxxii.; Isa. xi. 6; xxv. 8; lxv. 66; Hosea ii. 21 ff.; Amos ix. 13; Zephaniah, &c.; and on the Jewish-Rabbinical eschatology, see Tholuck again, p. 423. It is noteworthy that Rabbinical Judaism has even assimilated itself to heathendom, in that its expectation has become chiefly retrospective, like the longing of the heathen for the golden age (that is, an expectation of the grotesque restoration of sensuous glory), while the Old Testament anticipation of Israel, the "people of the future," has been consummated in the eschatology of the New Testament. On the eschatology of the New Testament, we must refer to biblical and dogmatic theology (see *Commentary on Matthew*, pp. 418-434; 1 Cor. xv.; 2 Peter, pp. 46 ff.). For remarks on ecclesiastical eschatology, especially on Luther's discourses concerning the future form of the world; on the question *de duratione brutorum;* on the distortion of the end of the world into the gross representation of an utter destruction of the world by the Lutheran doctrinal writers of the seventeenth century; and on the restriction of the Apostle's entire description to mere human relations, &c., see Tholuck, pp. 425-428.—It is a beautiful idea of Theodore of Mopsvestia, that "things visible and invisible" constitute a κόσμος, for the comprehension of which (consisting, as it does, of all created things together), in one pledge of love, man (consisting, as he does, of both worlds) was created; that, after his fall, the higher spirits alienated themselves from him; but at the prospect of his restoration, they dedicated themselves to his service, and now rejoice in his restoration, &c. This idea is more in place in the passage relating to the original founding of the new world in the absolute atonement (Col. ii. 20), than in the present passage, relating to the glorification of the present world.—We can avoid all fanciful ideas in regard to the question *de duratione brutorum*, and apply Christian principles only, by treating it in brief allusions:

(1.) The morbid sundering of types analogous to

the formation of human heathendom. The opposite must therefore be a return of nature to collective fundamental types.

(2.) The morbid increase of individuals, analogous to the extravagant generation of the human proletarian. The opposite is the preponderance of constant existence over an excited growth.

(3.) The rise of a preponderance, of the most subordinate forms, of parasites, of forms doomed to decay. The opposite is the dynamical dominion of pure forms, the negation of parasites.

(4.) The reflexive formation of the morbid form of death in original, ideal forms.

(5.) The absolute connection of the creature thus idealized with man, and its appropriation by man.

Here, as well as to the following paragraph, belong Ps. lxxii.; Isa. lxv. 66; John Walther's hymn, "It makes one heartily rejoice;" G. Arnould's hymn, "O Breaker of all bonds;" Schiller's poem, "Oh, from this valley's depths;" and expressions of Fr. von Schlegel, Bettina, and others, on the anxious expectation of nature.

6. The most prominent views on eschatology may be distinguished thus: (1.) The Gnostic-dualistic view, with which we must also unite the recent theosophic views in general; (2.) The Positivist, which holds to an absolute catastrophe without interpositions; (3.) The Rationalistic, which does not get beyond the notion of a gradual idyllic improvement of nature and humanity; (4.) The christologico-dynamical, which defines eschatology from the centre (which operates as a principle), of the death, the resurrection, and the glorification of Christ. This is also essentially the patristic view. To modern philosophical unbelief the beginning of the world, as well as its end, is sunk in mist and night, because to it the centre of the world—the historical Christ—is sunk in mist and night.

The christological and dynamical view stands in particular need, at the present time, of a vigorous development. It appears everywhere throughout the Scriptures, and is strongly expressed in Eph. i. 19, and also in Phil. iii. 21. Tholuck: "It is noteworthy that in Phil. iii. 21 the same ὑποτάσσειν, which here expresses subjection to matter, denotes the operation of Divine power through which matter shall be glorified."

B. *The groaning of believers themselves* (vers. 23–25).

1. The Apostle speaks of a twofold testimony of the language of groans, which is further divided into a threefold one. The creature groans in its painful struggle for perfection; the life of believers groans. But as believers groan in their consciousness and conscious sense of life, so also does the spirit, in its ethical struggle, groan in the ground of its life.

2. The *groaning* is related to *tears*, as labor is to rest. Tears relieve the passive resignation of the soul to God's counsel amid its conflict with the hindrances of life; the groaner labors in his recourse to God's act in heaven against the power of hindrances. Tears flow from this opposition, since they come from God; the groaner protests against the opposition by appealing to God. Both are twin children of the ὑπομονή, which now proves itself as patience and now as steadfastness. Compare the history of the groans and tears of Christ. On the great power and importance which tears and groans have as signals of the most extreme distress of the invisible world in conflict with the visible, and of the higher in conflict with the lower, compare the evidences of the Holy Scriptures by the aid of a concordance. Herder: "The smoke from the burning forest does not rise so high heavenward as does the burdened man's groan" (see James v. 9).

3. The idea of the ἀπαρχή denotes not merely the first beginning—harvest, for example—and not only the most excellent, but also the pledge and representation of the future totality which is assured in the successful beginning. But so is God's Spirit the pledge of glory. See the *Exeg. Note*.

4. Without a comprehension (which is often very defective) of the relation between the principial Christian life and the same life in its broadest completion—which is suggested even by the development of every grain of wheat—it must appear a wonderful thing that the believer already possesses *adoption*, according to ver. 16, and that, according to ver. 23, he first expects the adoption with groaning; that he has *righteousness*, and yet must strive after righteousness (2 Tim. iv. 8); that he is truly delivered and saved, and yet is only delivered and saved in hope. The grand and mysterious elaboration of this development renders its comprehension more difficult, and therefore many speak of an *ideal* possession, and the like. The principial possession is, indeed, also an ideal one, in so far as the idea of perfection is contained in the principle, and always appears more grand from it, but the realization of the idea is only begun in it; it perfectly exists as a foundation in the germ. On the variety of such antitheses as βασιλεία, σωτηρία, and ἀπολύτρωσις, see Tholuck, p. 436. Theodoret has even perverted the antithesis into that of ὄνομα and πρᾶγμα; the Socinians distinguished *tenere fide* and *frui;* Tholuck speaks, with De Wette, of a "partial definition of the idea of υἱοθεσία;" and Luther translated thus: "We patiently wait for the adoption, and expect," &c. The Codd. D. F. G., in surprise at the expectation of the adoption, leave out the υἱοθεσίαν.

5. No grander and more glorious thing can be said of the original state of the human body, than that its full deliverance (from sinfulness, misery, death, decay, and perishableness) shall be its transformation to the glorious freedom of the children of God. That the resurrection of the flesh is also declared with the glorification of the body, comp. my *Vermischte Schriften*, vol. ii. pp. 232 ff.

C. *The groaning of the Spirit imparted to believers* (vers. 26, 27).

1. On the contradictions arising from the identification of the groaning spirit with the Holy Spirit itself, comp. the *Exeg. Notes*. We are led here to the antithesis which the Apostle brings out in 1 Cor. xiv. 15. It is the Christian, religious-ethical formation of an antithesis, whose physical foundation is the twofold form of consciousness originally peculiar to the present human life.* Compare, on this point, *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft*, &c., 1851, p. 242.

2. According to Tholuck's view (p. 438), when the believer is in the greatest distress, he knows least of all how to find a verbal expression of his prayer. But, according to the Psalms, necessity teaches how to pray; the greatest distress becomes

* [This view of Dr. Lange is one to which exception has been taken throughout the *Exeg. Notes*, from chap. vii. 14 to the close of chap. viii.; it is not necessary, then, to enter upon a new discussion of it here.—R.]

prophetical when recourse is had to God. But it is just in the calmest states that the believer needs most of all the interceding Spirit. Indeed, distress gives to prayer a strong expression of human feeling, and in so far Tholuck's view is applicable to the prayer of distress in a more special sense. The intercession of the Spirit denotes the more direct access which God's children, in their inmost heart, have gained to the Father through Christ, according to John xvi. 26. For the real Advocate with the Father is Christ (1 John ii. 1); the Holy Spirit, as such, is the present Comforter of believers, in opposition to the world (John xiv. 16).*

3. The real nature of true prayer is the union of the human and divine Spirit, prompted by God's Spirit. Hence the prophetical confidence of the Amen. This union, according to which God is not only the author and finisher, but also the disposer of prayer, is represented most of all in the mystical adoration of a spirit absorbed in communion with God. On this point, see the expression of Jelaleddin, in Tholuck, p. 443.

4. On the groaning of the creature, see Bucer's beautiful expression, in Tholuck, p. 440.

Second Paragraph, vers. 28-37.

A. *The certainty of salvation in the saving purpose of Divine grace, as the causa primaria (efficiens) of salvation* (vers. 28–30).

1. The certainty of salvation is divided into two lines, one of inward and individual life, and the other of external relations. Both have three starting-points in common: *a*. The *causa primaria*, the purpose of God (ver. 29); *b*. The *causa meritoria*, the gift of His Son (ver. 32); *c*. The *causa apprehendens*, or *organica*, faith in its development into the life of love (ver. 28). Believers are here called *those who love God*, because, in their love for God, the reflection of God's love has become manifested in them. The progress of the expectation and joyfulness of personal life toward the dark and concealed ground of life, as to the absolute and spiritually clear personality, which is one with love itself, is not the ground, but the sign and evidence that our personal life has been appointed and called into being by God's eternal counsel of love and grace. In our love for God there is revealed His love for us, and in our personality there shines the reflection of His personality. But with this there appears the dynamical central line of life—that of the Divine determinations of the persons allied to God—to which the whole succession and course of things is made subservient.

2. The divine πρόθεσις denotes the eternal relation of God to the course of the world called into being by Him, but also called to free self-development under His authority; just as is the case with the two terms βουλή and εὐδοκία. All these definitions denote God's eternal thought and plan of the world; but they denote it in different relations. The εὐδοκία designates the central point of the Divine purpose, its anticipating love, the ideal perception and contemplation of the personal kingdom. Beside it there stands, on the one hand, the βουλή, God's going to himself for counsel, the look of His intelligence at the necessities of the free development of the world; and, on the other hand, there stands the πρόθεσις, as the establishment of His government over the beginning, the middle, and the ultimate object of His institution of love. The εὐδοκία settles the children of salvation; the βουλή perceives the conditions of salvation; and the πρόθεσις determines the stages of salvation. But that this is not the decree of fate, but rather qualified and communicated according to the stages of the free spiritual kingdom, is plain from the very term used to describe Christians: that they are *called* according to the purpose—called, not compelled. Tholuck: "πρόθεσις. The πρό is not the temporal *before*, as in προέγνω, which Beza and Pareus hold, but as the prefix in προτίθεσθαι. Yet they are not merely *nude*, called according to a Divine decree, but according to one whose stages to the ultimate object of the ἐδόξασε are laid down." But the idea of the κλῆσις appears here in a narrower sense as a definition of God's children, characterized by penitence and faith, baptism and confession; the more general idea, on the contrary, appears in ver. 28.

3. All things and events must be subordinate and subservient to, and promotive of, the highest purposes of God—the realization of His kingdom of love, and therefore the salvation of His elect. Augustine: *Deus est adeo bonus, quod nihil mali esse permitteret, nisi adeo esset potens, ut ex quolibet malo possit elicere aliquod bonum* (Tholuck, p. 444).

4. *And we know* (ver. 28). We know not what we should pray for as we ought; but God knows the meaning of the groaning of our spirit, and we know, too, that all things work together for good to them that love God. This knowledge is not merely a direct confidence of the spirit, but is based upon the most certain argument: *a*. In our love for God, His love for us appears; *b*. But God reigns omnipotently, and disposes all things according to the counsel of His love; *c*. Consequently, all things must become providences of the loving God.

5. We hold that the passage in vers. 29 and 30 contains the whole Divine plan of salvation, from the first foundation to the ultimate object, and we have repeatedly treated it from this point of view (see my *Positive Dogmatik*, p. 956). We remark first of all, exegetically, that the passage in Eph. i. 4–14 is an explanatory parallel to the present passage. As the foreknowing here precedes the predestinating, so there the choosing (ver. 4) precedes the predestinating (ver. 5); from which it follows that both the foreknowing and the electing mean essentially the same thing—an act preceding the predestination. To καλεῖν or κλῆσις in the present passage there corresponds in that passage ἐχαρίτωσεν, accepting, &c., in ver. 6, which the Apostle resumes in ver. 11, and specially elaborates. To the justifying here, there then corresponds there the following: "in whom we have redemption," &c., in ver. 7. But finally, the glorifying here is reflected in the "wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom," &c. But Paul also there refers all these individual parts to the "good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself" (in ver. 9). So that it plainly follows there that the "predestinating" relates specifically to the "purpose," while the "purpose" appears to be qualified by the βουλή, "counsel," as this latter is qualified by the "good pleasure." But we learn, in reference to the first act, the "choosing" in the Epistle to the Ephesians, that election took place *in Christ* before the foundation

* [This distinction presents no valid objection to the intercession of the Holy Spirit. For it is one made in and through us, as that of Christ is for us.—R.]

of the world (see John xvii.), just as we learn that the glorifying or guidance of believers to "glory" will be identical with being led "to the praise of his glory," according to the idea that the beholding of the glory of God will constitute the glory of believers, and that the former will be revealed in the latter (1 John iii. 2).—We may further observe, that a real difference exists between election and foreordination, or predestination, and that the προγινώσκειν cannot possibly mean foreknowledge, in God's idea, of subjects already present (for whence would they have come into God's idea?), but that it can only mean the loving and creative sight, in God's intuitive vision, of human personalities for a preliminary ideal existence. The doctrine of predestination of Augustine, of the Middle Ages, and of the Reformers, could not reach this idea of election *intellectually* (Christian faith has always reached it in spirit), because the distinction between the idea of the individual personality of man and the idea of the "specimen of every kind" had not yet been definitely attained. It is now clear that such a "foreknowing" of God in relation to all human individuals must be accepted, because man is an individual thought of God; and that the same must hold good of "electing," in so far as each individual is distinct in his solitary separation from all other individuals, and has a solitary call (see Rev. ii. 17). But it follows from this that the foreknowing of the "elect," when it has become manifest, must be accepted in the most emphatic sense, analogously to the fact that Abraham is, in God's typical kingdom, the elect κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν, and that Christ is the elect in God's real kingdom in the absolute sense, so that all His followers are chosen together with Him as organic members, according to their organic relations (Eph. i.). From both propositions it follows, further, that election does not constitute an *infinite opposition* between such as are ordained to salvation and such as are ordained to condemnation, but an *infinite difference* of destinations for glory; which difference, however, can be the basis of an actual opposition (see Matt. xxv. 24), and therefore is also combined with this. As the foreknowing expresses the collective foundation, the godlike spiritual nature of the elect as the product and object of Divine love, there is comprised in the electing not only their election from the mass of the world, but also the distinguishing feature of their χαρίσματα and characters. In addition to the earlier perversions of this doctrine of the eternal foundation of personal essence—a doctrine of the highest importance to our times—we may add the recent assertion of Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, vol. i. p. 227), that the ἐκλέγεσθαι relates not merely to individuals, but to the entire body, and, accordingly, to individuals as members of the body. The Apostle says οὕς four times, and τούτους three times. After the ideal determinations of personalities themselves, there can now follow the predestination of their ὅρος in time and space, their whole lot (including the previously determined permission and control of the fall). For the foundation of the world corresponds to the history of the world. But the fate of each individual is designed to mature him, under *gratia præveniens*, for conversion, and when this object is reached, it is his turn; he is τεταγμένος (Acts xiii. 48). From this it now follows that the "calling," in a special sense, first makes its appearance with the theocratical and evangelical revelation and its preaching of salvation. Those in whom the outward call of God has become an inward one, are "called" in the specific sense; yet the typical "call" first becomes perfectly real in the New Testament. As the life-sphere of election is the spiritual kingdom, and the life-sphere of foreordination is the history of the world, so is the Church the life-sphere of the call. But if godly sorrow leadeth to salvation, and germinating faith to saving faith, the justifying will be realized. This becomes decided by the Spirit of "adoption," which spirit, however, now begins to operate also as πνεῦμα τῆς δόξης, and in reciprocal action with it even the whole historical experience of God's children becomes a δοξάζεσθαι, a guidance to glory. On the modes of this guidance, which have been but little developed doctrinally, see my *Positive Dogmatik*, p. 1064.

As far as the five divine saving acts are concerned, five human elements must correspond with them, according to the sphere of love and freedom. According to the christological idea, the Divine acts and human elements should come together in five points of union, somewhat as follows:

Election.	Ordination.	Call (as awakening and illumination).	Justification.	Glorification.
Religious Foundation.	Destiny.	Conversion.	Faith.	Holiness.
Determination to salvation.	Pilgrimage, or striving.	Life of Prayer.	Peace, Adoption.	Godly life of Love.

If we reduce the five elements to three: foundation, execution, end (ἀρχή, τρόπος, τέλος), the two elements of execution—*call* and *justification*—denote the incipient and decided new birth (from water and the Spirit). The δόξα denotes regeneration in the sense of completion (Matt. xix. 28). The sum of all the Divine operations taken together is *grace;* the sum of all the human elements is the *growing freedom* of God's children; and the sum of all points of union is *eternal life.*

It is only from the standpoint of the call and of justification that man can look retrospectively at his ordination and election in the light of God's love, and prospectively at his object, the δόξα. But if, on the other hand, he would infer his own justification from his assumed election, this would be a standpoint of self-deception, and he would make his own justification out of the fragmentary work of holiness, and this would become self-torment or self-righteousness. The believing sinking into the image and righteousness of Christ, is a sinking into the fountain of eternal life, which then sinks thereby, as though unobserved, into the heart.*

* [These *Notes* of Dr. Lange are very just, in their opposition to such a sundering of the acts of God in our salvation (here represented, as they necessarily must be to our finite minds, as successive), as will make of election and predestination something arbitrary on the part of God. The guard he sets about the doctrine of human personality is very necessary, especially for minds trained in the school of hyper-Calvinism. Still he has not solved the problem. The Apostle himself does not do it. He but presents, for the security of *believers*, the objective ground of their confidence. Those rightly read, who read to learn for their comfort what God has done for them in eternity. *How He*, to whom all time is present, whose eternity enters into

B. *The certainty of salvation in its historical gift and establishment in Christ, in opposition to historical contradiction in persecutions* (vers. 31–37).

1. The thesis of the perfect historical securities of the salvation of Christians. Ver. 31 says: If God be for us, all the hindrances and restrictions to our salvation are nullified as such. Nothing can harm us. Ver. 32: Since God did not spare His own Son for us, He has given us already every thing in principle, in order to give it to us in His own time in reality; all the aids for our salvation are given to us; every thing contributes to our good.

2. The Apostle represents, in four distinct elements, the complete security of our perfect salvation in Christ. His death removes our deserved condemnation. His resurrection raises us above the sense of condemnation into the confidence and spiritual life of adoption. His sitting at the right hand of God protects us against all condemning powers, and is the pledge of our acquittal at the judgment. His intercession abolishes the last remains of condemnation in our life, and secures us against relapse. On the *dissensus* between the Reformed and Lutheran theology in reference to Christ's sitting at the right hand of God, see Tholuck, p. 458. Tholuck decides in favor of the view that the right hand of God is *ubique*, and the sitting at the right hand of God indicates the Saviour's entrance into absolute freedom from all restraint. But if we will not regard the "absolute freedom from all restraint" in a purely negative sense, we are driven with this freedom itself to the positiveness of an absolute situation and standpoint in glory. On the views relating to the *intercessio*, see Tholuck, p. 459. According to Tholuck, the *intercessio* must be strictly regarded only with reference to Heb. vii. 25; ix. 24; 1 John ii. 1: according to Meyer, it is *vocalis et oralis*. But it may be asked, Is it analytical, or synthetical? The glorified Christ, in His eternal purpose of love, is himself, as the personal and complete Word, the personified intercession *He appears* in the presence of the Father for us (Heb. ix. 24). For statements relating to this subject, see Tholuck, p. 461.

C. *Conclusion.*

1. The Apostle has enumerated seven oppositions that can operate against us as temptations to relapse. There are seven, from the beginning of labor to rest. He here enumerates the forces which can oppose us in our fellowship of love with the Lord; these are ten in number. But this is the number of the finished course of the world. By *height* we might have in mind the ὕψωμα, in the sense of 2 Cor. x. 5; and by *depth*, Rev. ii. 24. Yet both terms are essentially the same, and we prefer the explanation given in the *Exeg. Notes*.

2. The assumption that different classes of angels are spoken of in this passage, has resulted in various changes of the text. Also in Eph. i. 21, the Apostle has chosen expressions which comprise as well present powers of the world as future spiritual powers. The same holds good in reference to Col. i. 16. Paul has given no ground for a definite hierarchy of angels; neither has Peter done so in 1 Peter iii. 22. On Tholuck's discussion concerning angelic classes, see pp. 461 ff.

3. There is a special need, in our day, of bringing forward the absolutely dynamical view of the world in opposition to a groundless and illimitable atomistic one. But the vital way to bring about this view, is the experience and developed perception of the absolute operation of the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.

4. Thus chap. viii. advances from the certainty of freedom from condemnation, in ver. 1, to the certainty of eternal salvation, in ver. 39.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 18–23. The groaning of the creature. 1. What are we to understand by "creature" here? 2. Why does it groan? 3. For what does it groan? (vers. 18–23.)—The magnitude of the future glory of God's children. 1. It makes us forget all the sufferings of this present time; 2. It satisfies not only our expectation, but also the anxious expectation of the whole creation (vers. 18–23).—Why are the sufferings of this present time not worthy to be compared to the future glory? 1. Because our sufferings, however great, come to an end with this present time; 2. The glory, on the contrary, will continue forever (ver. 18).—Comparison of the sufferings of this present time with the glory which shall be revealed in us: 1. The former bring pain, cares, and tears; 2. The latter brings eternal health, peace, and joy (ver. 18).—The revelation of God's children is a revelation of their life (concealed with Christ in God) of courageous faith, fervent love, and calm hope; Col. iii. 3 (ver. 19).—The creature in the service of corruption (ver. 21).—The creature transformed to glory (ver. 21).—Believers in the possession of not only the first-fruits of the Spirit (faith, knowledge, love, patience, chastity, &c.), but also in the possession of God's full adoption, since the body also will be delivered from the bondage of corruption (ver. 23).

LUTHER: God will not only make the earth, but also heaven, more beautiful. This present time is His working garb; afterward He will put on an Easter coat and a Pentecostal robe (vers. 18–23).

STARKE: Wonder and rejoice, ye cross-bearers, for your heavy and wearisome sufferings are only a drop compared with the boundless sea of joys, and as a grain of sand in the balance against hundreds of thousands of pounds (2 Cor. iv. 17). "*Non sunt condignæ passiones hujus sæculi ad præteritam culpam, quæ remittitur; ad præsentem consolationis gratiam, quæ immittitur; ad futuram gloriam quæ promittitur;*" BERNH., *De Convers. ad cleric*, c. 30 (ver. 18). The creature will not be utterly annihilated, but renewed, and placed in a more glorious state (ver. 21).—HEDINGER: Woe to those who revile, torment, and abuse God's creatures! (ver. 19.)

SPENER: What would not a soldier suffer, if he knew that he should become a General? But here is a glory succeeding suffering, beside which all the glory of the greatest emperors and kings is only a shadow (ver. 18).—ROOS: The sufferings of this present time are infinitely small compared with this infinite weight of glory (ver. 18).—The glory is contrasted with the corruption, and freedom with bondage. That which is glorious will last eternally; and

these very acts, did these gracious acts, is beyond our comprehension. *Why He did them*, is answered, so far as it can be answered here, only by the responsive love of a believer's heart. We need only hold fast to the fact; that it is a fact in general, the Apostle makes abundantly clear; that it is a fact in our case, can only be clear according to the measure of our consciousness of being in Christ, "in whom he hath chosen us, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy, and without blame before him in love" (Eph. i. 4). Comp. chap. ix. on the more difficult phases of this subject.—R.]

that which is free may indeed be used and enjoyed by others, but is not in a state of bondage or slavery (vers. 20, 21).—What is spiritual, will become completely spiritual, and, consequently, will be revealed in great glory. Paul calls this state of glory the state of adoption, because God's children will then completely show their honor in themselves, fully enjoy their Father's love—in a word, will be heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ (vers. 22, 23).

GERLACH: As the mother in travail delivers the living child, as it were, from death, so does nature, groaning under the power of death, struggle to bring forth from itself a new and incorruptible creation. "Not you alone, but what is much lower than you are, and without reason and conscience, shall share with you your blessings. The creation will be free from the bondage of corruption; that is, it will no more be corruptible, but will keep pace with the glorification of your body. For as it became corruptible when you did, so will it again follow you when you become immortal. As a nurse who fostered a king's son will herself enjoy his possessions as soon as he attains his father's throne, so will it be with creation. Do you see how man everywhere goes ahead, and every thing happens for his sake? Do you see how the Apostle comforts the struggling one, and points him to the unutterable love of God? But he does not merely comfort; he also shows the certainty of what he says. For if the creature which was created for your sake has hope, how much more do you have hope for whose sake the creature shall enjoy all these blessings! Thus, when the son appears in his glory, shall men clothe their servants in more glorious robes to the honor of the son;" Chrysostom (vers. 18–23).

LISCO: The magnitude and universality of the future perfection (vers. 18–23).—All the *sufferings* of this present time, both physical and spiritual, which we must endure on the way to our future *glorification*, bear no comparison to this perfection. The *proof* of this is, that the *creature*, the whole creation, both irrational creation and every thing which is still outside of fellowship with Christ, is anxiously waiting for the revelation of the still concealed glory of God's children, the truly new-born; in which glorification the whole creation will participate, for it is universal and great. The *ground* of this anxious expectation of the whole creation is partially owing to the subjection of the latter to *vanity*, and in part to the *hope* that it shall be delivered from that state which is subject to vanity, and shall participate in the glorious freedom of God's children (vers. 18–21).

HEUBNER: "Temporal sufferings are a differential of the future glory which shall be revealed; that is, they are so infinitely small that they have no value compared with the future glory" (SILBERSCHLAG, *Dreieinigkeit*, vol. iv. p. 188).—The sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us: 1. In respect to duration; 2. Quantity; and 3. Quality.—The sufferings are a mote, the glory is a hundred-weight; the former are but a drop, the latter a sea (ver. 18).—Paul designs to show: 1. The certainty of this future in opposition to doubters, as in 2 Peter iii. 4, who say that all things continue as they were; he answers, by saying: No; nature does not remain unchangeable; nature itself has a tendency to transformation and completion; 2. The magnitude of salvation, for it is the object and limit of the whole creation; it must therefore be exceedingly abundant.—Revelation of the children of God. *What* will then be revealed? 1. The inmost and deepest nature of their hearts; 2. The distinguished grace of God toward them, which is the glorious destination to which God elevates them. *To whom* will the revelation be made? To themselves, to the angels, to the believing children of God, to the world, and to all devils (ver. 19).—The vanity to which the creature is subject is manifested specifically as follows: 1. The creation has lost its original charm, its beauty, its durableness, and its uniformity; 2. It has become corrupted by much that is injurious or useless; 3. It is now given over to abuse (vers. 20, 21).—How is the self-anxiety of nature to be regarded? We must suppose nature to have a consciousness, a feeling, and that it would say: "What must I suffer! how must I be abused!" Supposing particular objects to speak, the sun would say: "How must I shine upon the wicked works of men! how am I compelled to see every thing!" The earth: "What must I bear! what blood must I absorb!" The gardens and fields: "How are we wasted in excess!" Gold and silver: "How are we perverted into idols!" Beasts: "How are we tormented and abused!" If the Almighty were to open the mouths of many beasts of burden, how would the irrational brutes complain against rational man! (ver. 22.)—The Christian is *l'homme de désir* (St. Martin), a man of longings.

BESSER: The martyrdom of the creature is twofold, and its coronation will also be twofold: 1. It suffers death, under whose pains the elephant groans and the worm writhes; 2. It suffers violence and injustice from the ungrateful and malicious; and it suffers involuntarily, for it is subject to these through God's authority (ver. 19). The glory of God's children is freedom—freedom from sin and death—freedom from the tyranny of the devil and the world (ver. 21).—The Apostle says: *We are waiting for the adoption.* It is the mystery of Christianity, that we *wait* for what we already *have*, or that we *are* and at the same time *are not* what we shall be. We are righteous and sinful; we are holy and impure; we are kings and slaves; we are free and bond; we are living and dead; we are saved and condemned; —we are all the former, apart from ourselves, in Christ; we are all of the latter in ourselves, apart from Christ (ver. 23).

Vers. 24–28. The salvation of Christians in the present life is a salvation: 1. In hope; 2. In patience; 3. In prayer (vers. 24–28).—The *one* Christian hope in distinction from the *many* worldly hopes. 1. It has a good ground—Christ, on whom we can build; 2. A certain object—eternal salvation (ver. 24).—What a man seeth he cannot hope for; if we therefore hope, the object of our hope must be invisible (vers. 24, 25).—Christian patience: 1. In what does it consist? 2. In whom is it found? (ver. 25).—Intercession for us by the Spirit of God. 1. How does it take place? 2. With what results? (vers. 26, 27).—It is only when we perceive our infirmities that God's Spirit intercedes for us with unutterable groans (ver. 26).—A glance at the inmost life of prayer of God's saints. We here perceive. 1. Our great weakness; 2. The comforting intercession by the Spirit of God; 3. God's friendly hearkening to our prayer (vers. 26–28).—Praise God for His compassion shown in the Spirit's helping us in our infirmities (ver. 26).—The unutterable groanings of the Spirit (ver. 26).—God knoweth the heart (ver 27).—Are we also saints? Does God's Spirit

also intercede for us? Can we also hope that our prayer will be answered? (vers. 26, 27).—Under what circumstances do we, too, know that all things work together for our good? 1. When we love God; 2. When we are conscious of our call (ver. 28).—The Christian view of human destiny (ver. 28).—How many men are still very far from knowing that all things must work together for good to them that love God! 1. Proof that such is the case; 2. Statement of the grounds of this phenomenon.

STARKE: Impatience in distress arises from want of hope; 2 Kings vi. 29, 31 (ver. 25).—SPENER: We do not know what would always be useful to us, and, if left completely to our own choice, would often pray for things which might be injurious, rather than useful. We also do not understand how prayer should be best formed, and in such a way as most likely to be heard, especially in seasons when necessity is great, and the heart is perplexed; but the Spirit intercedes for us in the best way, with unutterable groanings (ver. 26).—We, in whom there are such groans, often do not ourselves understand what we pray for, for the anxiety of the heart is so great that it can express nothing more *than a sorrowful but confident desire for the grace of God;* but the remaining prayer is shaped by the Holy Spirit, and brought before God's throne (ver. 27).—ROOS: Here (ver. 27) the Holy Spirit intercedes for us as a wise father intercedes for his child, who does not know how to address a great nobleman as he should, when he puts into his mouth refined language and a fitting compliment.

BENGEL: In this purpose of God lie concealed the very first roots of the justification and glorification of believers (ver. 28).

GERLACH: The personality of man is no passing show, and does not pass away into universal life; but it only lives truly a life of the spirit when the personal Spirit of God is the soul of its life—when God is in it—when the Spirit of the eternal fellowship of the Father and of the Son, of God and of His creation, is in it (ver. 26). By this means the prayer of the believing Christian first receives a strong and sure ground that the Spirit prays out of him; and by this means it becomes clear how such great petitions as the first three of the Lord's Prayer are placed by the Lord in the mouth of the weakest believer (ver. 27).—It is God who worketh all in all for our salvation (Phil. ii. 13); therefore all things, His creatures who live, move, and have their being in Him, coöperate for the same end; not with Him, or beyond Him, but in Him and through Him. Even all the evil that takes place on the earth coöperates for good; for the will of the creature, which tears itself asunder from its Creator, is evil, and the evil continues to exist in this will; but the evil that results as the work of this will is, in so far as it interferes with God's order of the world, God's own work, is overruled by Him for good. If a child or friend of ours is struck by lightning, or killed by a murderer, it is God's work in both cases, so far as the matter concerns us; even God's own retributive judgments, which requite the evil deed with evil, become a blessing to him who learns to love Him under the blows of His rod, so that then His penal justice is no more revealed therein, but purifying love and grace (ver. 28).

LISCO: *Patience* waits; it is established on *hope*, which is the direction of the spirit toward a future good. Hope is established on *faith*, which is the grasping of the promise that holds out the blessing; this promise, which is contained in God's *word*, is the ground of faith; God's word is therefore the ground of all (ver. 25).

HEUBNER: Hope is advanced faith (ver. 24).—To hope, and to act in hope, are the strength of the soul (ver. 25).—The heart of the Christian is a sanctuary, a dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit (ver 26).—Divine omniscience has a very comforting side God knows the inmost faithfulness of the Christian's heart. The true Christian desires to be searched, and to have his heart seen; the false Christian fears this (ver. 27).—"*Deus nihil mali sinit accidere, ex quo non aliquid boni possit et velit elicere;*" AUGUSTINE (ver. 28).

Vers. 29-39. Summary of the Christian order of salvation. 1. Election; 2. Ordination; 3. Call; 4. Justification; 5. Glorification (vers. 29, 30).—The Only-begotten of the Father is at the same time the first-born among many brethren (ver. 29).—Let us never forget that we should be brethren of our Lord Jesus Christ (ver. 29).—The call, justification, and glorification correspond to the threefold office of Christ (vers. 29, 30).—Why do we, as Christians, not need to fear? 1. Because *God*, who delivered His only Son for us, and with Him will also freely give us all things, is for us; 2. Because *Christ* is here, who has finished His work for us; 3. Because *we ourselves*, for the sake of Him who hath loved us, are able to endure every danger, and to allow nothing to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord (vers. 31-39).—If God be for us, who can be against us? Or, God's protection bids defiance to our enemies (in times of war) (ver. 31).—If God be for us, who can be against us? 1. Ask whether God is for us; 2. Look at the enemies (ver. 31).—The gracious gift of God's Son (ver. 32).—Four believing and joyous questions of the Apostle, with the same number of answers evincing certainty of triumph (vers. 31-39).

STARKE: The precious chain of the blessings of salvation, which far excels all golden chains and jewels (1 John iii. 1, 2) (ver. 30).—Even the smallest child of God can defy the whole world; therefore, what a great privilege all the children of God have! O man, be converted, and this day become a child of God! (ver. 31.)—Though the whole world condemn you, and cry out against you: "Crucify him! crucify him! away with him!" smile at it; for if God justifies you, nothing can condemn you (ver. 33).—"*Hoc habet proprium ecclesia: dum persecutionem patitur, floret; dum opprimitur, crescit; dum contemnitur, proficit; dum læditur, vincit; dum arguitur, intelligit; tunc stat, cum superari videtur;*" HILARIUS, i. 8, *De Trinit.* (ver. 37).—Strong heroic faith, which will allow nothing to separate from the love of God in Christ. Oh, Almighty God, arm us with the same sense, in order that we may remain true to death! 2 Tim. iv. 8 (ver. 39).—LANGE: What will it help you, poor man, if you have many great, rich, and mighty men in the world, and even a partial judge at the judgment? If God and your own conscience be against you, how soon will the table be turned against you? Job ix. 4 (ver. 31).—OSIANDER: Even though Satan should make a row against our sins before God's judgment-seat, he will not be able to accomplish any thing, but will be compelled to pack off to hellish fire with his charge (ver. 33).

SPENER: It is the order of Divine beneficence that foreknowledge and foreordination take place in eternity, but the call, justification, and glorification

occur in time (ver. 30).—He who has not hesitated to give the greatest blessing, will also not be sparing of smaller ones (ver. 32).

Roos: Many would be against us, but they are nothing against God (ver. 32).—Paul had previously spoken (vers. 32–34) of judicial charges, but now he speaks of hostile powers that would violently snatch us away, and separate us from the love of Christ, which he afterward calls the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord (vers. 35–39).

GERLACH: The Apostle has now, in spirit, reached the top of the mount of glorification, and looks back once more at the transitory hindrances, and the victory of believers, in the midst of their unfinished conflicts. That which here disturbs the peace of believers, and threatens to deprive them of their comfort, is of a twofold character: it is inward and outward. *Inwardly* it is *sin*, *outwardly* it is *tribulation;* in part it is the necessity of life in general, and in part it is the temptations specially appointed for the Christian (vers. 31–39).

LISCO: The blessed certainty of the grace of their God strengthens believers to conquer all temptations and embarrassments (vers. 31–34).—As Abraham's love of God strengthened him for the greatest and sorest sacrifice, so is the greatest expression of God's love for us the gift of His Son; it is an act of love which infinitely exceeds all else that God has done for us as Creator, Preserver, and Ruler (ver. 32).—With the strongly established conviction of God's grace toward us Christians, temporal sufferings, still less than those temptations (vers. 33, 34), cannot lead us astray in our certainty of salvation and glorification (vers. 35–39).

HEUBNER: Christ is the true and real Ideal of human virtue, to whom we should be conformed, and to whom we are appointed as Christians to be conformed. The higher we think of Christ, the higher must we think of ourselves (ver. 29).—The Christian is a brother of Jesus Christ (ver. 29).—"Faith," says Luther, "puts such courage into a man, that he can say, 'Though all devils should pounce upon me, and all kings, emperors, heaven, and earth, were against me, I nevertheless know that I shall be sustained.' He who has faith is in the Lord, and although he dies immediately, he must live again" (ver. 31).—Compare also PAUL GERHARD's excellent hymn, "If God be for me, I tread on all against me" (ver. 31).—The power of the Christian reaches further than his trials; his strength will never be wholly exhausted. And this strength is called love through Him who hath loved us; He, whose love raises us above all sufferings, strengthens us (1 Cor. xv. 57; 2 Cor. ii. 14; 1 John iv. 4; v. 4).

BESSER: The triumph of faith (vers. 31–39).

The Pericope for the 4th Sunday after Trinity, vers. 18–23.

HEUBNER: How the Christian regards the evils and imperfections of this world—the future rejuvenation of the earth.—The history of the earth. 1. What was the earth? A scene of God's glory. 2. What has it become? A scene of sin and death. 3. What shall it become? Renewed, glorified, and a part of heaven. 4. Who will live on it? Matt. v. 5.—The comfort which the gospel gives the suffering Christian.—APPUHN: The connection of the creation with man: 1. The creature has fallen with man; 2. It serves him against its will; 3. It bears his image in itself: as men contend and fight together, so is it among the lower orders of creation; 4. It anxiously expects deliverance with man.—GENZKEN: The token of future glory: 1. The anxious expectation of the creature; 2. The expectation of believers.—KAPFF: The deliverance of the groaning creature: 1. In nature; 2. In humanity in general; 3. In believers.—RANKE: The hope which Christians have of their future glory: 1. What is implied in this hope; 2. Its connection with the life of the Christian; 3. Its blessings.

The New Rhenish Pericopes: 1. Vers. 24–30, *for New-Year's Day.* DEICHERT: The great privilege of God's children, to be able constantly to hope for the best. 1. It is only God's children who know what is best; 2. It is only they who hope for it is a proper way; 3. Their hope rests upon the strongest grounds.

2. Vers. 31–39, *for the 13th Sunday after Trinity.* DEICHERT: The blessedness of God's child, who lies in His bosom in full faith of eternal love. 1. Such a child of God has every thing which can truly benefit him; 2. He is no more afraid that any thing can harm him; 3. He continues unseparated from eternal love.

On chap. viii. 28. SCHLEIERMACHER: On improving occasions of public calamity. 1. They appeal to us to know ourselves; 2. They greatly benefit us by making us better acquainted with God himself. (Delivered in Halle soon after the French occupation.)

LANGE: Christians, as God's children, are heirs of future glory. 1. The right of inheritance established on the New Testament; 2. Anxious waiting for the decision; 3. Its eternal institution; 4. The opponents of the right of inheritance; 5. Its assurance; 6. The infinite value of the inheritance.—The anxious expectation of the creature, as contrasted with man without this expectation in our day, is the same picture on a large scale which Balaam's ass presents on a small one. The Spirit in nature in opposition to the worldly-mindedness of skeptical natural philosophy.—Unspirituality in the garb of pretended natural philosophy, judged by its declarations: 1. Nature was not called into being by the Spirit of the Lord; 2. It does not testify to the dominion of the Spirit; 3. It does not strive for the revelation of the glory of the Spirit.—The true meaning of the groans: 1. Of the creature; 2. Of believers; 3. Of the Divine Spirit in their new life.—How does the case stand in reference to the battle of your life? 1. If God is not for you, every thing is against you, though every thing seems to be for you. 2. If God be for you, nothing is against you, though every thing seems to be against you. Nothing can harm us, for nothing can separate us.—Our fortress of rock: God's love in Jesus Christ our Lord.

[BURKITT: How will God's adopted children be made manifest? 1. In their persons; 2. In their actions; 3. In their condition.—The Holy Spirit intercedes for us: 1. By assisting us in duty; 2. By quickening our affections; 3. By enlarging our desires; 4. By setting us to groaning after the Lord.—Groaning denotes the strength and ardency of desire, which, through its fervency, puts the soul to pain and to a holy impatience till it is heard. If we want words, let us not want groans; Lord, let Thy Spirit help us to groan out a prayer when we want ability to utter it; for silent groans, proceeding from Thy Spirit, shall be heard in Thine ears when the loudest cries shall not be heard without it.

[HENRY: Though the soul be the principal part

of man, yet the Lord has declared himself for the body also, and has provided for it a great deal of honor and happiness. The future adoption of God's children is: 1. The adoption manifested before the world, angels, and men. Their honor is now clouded, but God will then publicly own all His children. The deed of adoption is now written, signed, and sealed; then it will be recognized, proclaimed, and published. 2. It is the adoption perfected and completed. The children of God have bodies as well as souls, and the adoption is not perfect until those bodies are brought into the glorious liberty promised the children of God.—Difference between faith and hope: 1. Faith has regard to the promise; hope, the thing promised. 2. Faith is the evidence of things not seen; hope is the expectation of them. 3. Faith is the mother; hope is the daughter.—SCOTT: All that we owe to the flesh is a holy revenge for the injuries already done, and the hindrances continually given us; and instead of rendering our state doubtful, by living after it in any degree, we should, by the Spirit, continually endeavor more and more to mortify it, and repress all its actions.—Sin has filled the world with suffering, yea, with unspeakable disorder and misery; all creatures seem to proclaim man's fatal apostasy, and to recommend the inestimably precious salvation of Christ. But the gospel opens a brighter prospect; a glorious crisis approaches, of which all things seem in anxious expectation.—CLARKE: Fluency in prayer is not essential to praying; a man may pray most powerfully in the estimation of God, who is not able to utter even one word. The unutterable groan is big with meaning, and God understands it, because it contains the language of His own Spirit. Some desires are too mighty to be expressed; there is no language expressive enough to give them proper form and distinct vocal sound. Such desires show that they came from God; and as they came from Him, so they express what God is disposed to do, and what He has purposed to do (ver. 27).

[HODGE: Observe, 1. As there is a dreadful pressure of sin and misery on the whole creation, we should not regard the world as our home; 2. It is a characteristic of genuine piety to have exalted conceptions of future blessedness, and earnest longings after it; 3. The reason why all things work together for the good of God's children is, that all things are under His control; 4. The plan of redemption, while it leaves no room for despondency, affords no pretence for assumption; 5. As there is a beautiful harmony and necessary connection between the several doctrines of grace, so must there be a like harmony in the character of the Christian.—The gospel is: 1. Wonderful; 2. Glorious; 3. Secure.—BARNES: Reasons why we are continued here in this state of vanity: 1. Christians are subjected to this state to do good to others; 2. Their remaining here shows the power of the gospel in overcoming sin, and in thus furnishing living evidence to the world of the power and excellence of that gospel; 3. It furnishes occasion for interesting exhibitions of character, and for increasing and progressive excellence; 4. It is a proper training for heaven.—Reasons why Christians do not know what to pray for: 1. They do not know what would be really best for them; 2. They do not know what God might be willing to grant them; 3. They are, to a great extent, ignorant of the character of God, the reason of His dealings, the principles of His government, and their own actual wants; 4. They are often in real and deep perplexity; and, if left alone, would neither be able to bear their own trials, nor know what to ask at the hand of God.—J. F. H.]

[HOMILETICAL LITERATURE ON THE WHOLE CHAPTER.—The homiletical literature on this chapter is very voluminous; we select the following, as being most important.—BISHOP COWPER, *Heaven Opened*, &c., *Works*, 11 (1619); E. PHILIPS, *Certaine Godly Sermons*, 243; EDW. ELTON, *Triumph of a True Christian Described* (*Three Excellent and Pious Treatises*, 1653); H. BINNING, *The Sinner's Sanctuary*, &c.; *being Forty-eight Sermons on the 8th Chapter of Romans*, *Works*, 1, 257; T. JACOMB, *Sermons Preached on the Whole 8th Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans* (only the sermons on the first four verses have been published, 1672); T. HORTON, *Forty-six Sermons upon the Whole 8th Chapter of the Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Romans* (1674); T. MANTON, *Forty-seven Sermons*, *Works*, 2; J. MESTREZAT, *Sermons sur la 8e chap. de l'Epitre aux Romains* (1702); T. BRYSON, *A Comprehensive View of the Real Christian's Character, Privileges, and Obligations* (1794); A. SHORT, *The Witness of the Spirit with our spirit, Illustrated from the 8th Chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (*Bampton Lectures*, 1846); O. WINSLOW, *No Condemnation in Christ Jesus, as unfolded in the 8th Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans* (new ed., 1857).—HOMILETICAL LITERATURE ON THE CARNAL MIND AND MAN'S ENMITY TO GOD.—C. SIMEON, *Works*, 15, 195; BISHOP STILLINGFLEET, *Serm.*, 3, 294; B. IBBOT, *Disc.*, 1, 365; J. EVANS, *Disc.*, 1, 93; J. DRYSDALE, *Serm.*, 1, 213; R. GRAVES, *Works*, 4, 159; *The Carnal and the Spiritual*, *Village Preacher*, 1, 181; C. SIMEON, *Works*, 15, 199; G. T. NOEL, *Serm.*, 2, 452; S. CHARNOCK, *Works*, 9, 175; ARCHBISHOP LEIGHTON, *Serm.*, *Works*, 3, 195; J. JAMIESON, *Serm.* (4) *on the Heart*, 2, 263, 381, 439, 465; G. BURDER, *Village Serm.*, 5; J. VENN, *Serm.*, 3, 56; T. DWIGHT, *Theology*, 4, 441; C. SCHOLL, *Serm.*, 158; E. COOPER, *Pract. Serm.*, 5, 17; T. CHALMERS, *Works*, 9, 66; H. CAULFIELD, *Irish Pulpit*, 2, 263; J. COOPER, *Serm.*, 28; C. SIMEON, *Works*, 15, 202; E. BLENCOWE, *Plain Sermons*, 2, 362; J. FENN, *Serm.*, 52.

[HOMILETICAL LITERATURE ON LIFE AFTER THE SPIRIT (vers. 13, 14), AND ON THE SPIRIT OF BONDAGE AND ADOPTION.—S. CLARKE, *Serm.*, 8, 23; BISHOP HALL, *Serm.*, *Works*, 5, 527; T. JACOMB, *Morning Exerc.*, 3, 585; R. SOUTH, *Serm.*, 5, 298, 326; T. WILSON, *Serm.*, 1, 389; L. ATTERBURY, *S Clapham*, *Serm.*, *selected*, 2, 173; M. HOLE, *On the Church Cat.*, 1, 55; N. CARTER, *Serm.*, 155; J. PEARSE, *Serm.*, 219; D. WATERLAND, *Serm.*, *Works*, 9, 325; R. ROBINSON, *Village Serm.*, 267; T. BELSHUM, *Disc.*, 1, 72; T. BIDDULPH, *Plain Serm.*, 3, 168; H. DRAPER, *On the Collects*, 2, 275; C. SIMEON, *Works*, 15, 270; BISHOP HEBER, *Parish Serm.*, 1, 443; S. F. SURTEES, *Serm.*; T. KNOWLES, *Disc.*, 3, 267; A. W. HARE, *Serm.*, 1, 77; W. G. G. COOKESLEY, *Serm.*, 2, 254; C. NEAT, *Disc.*, 223; A. B. EVANS, *Serm.*, 230; H. E. MANNING, *Serm.* 4, 27; A. WATSON, *Serm.* (1843), 134; N. MEERES, *Serm.*, 329; BISHOP WILBERFORCE, *Serm.*, 39; W. HOWORTH, *Serm.*, 32; BISHOP J. JACKSON, *Witness of the Spirit*, 145; I. WILLIAMS, *Serm.*, 2, 145; C. J. VAUGHAN, *Serm.* (1847), 77; C. BULLEN, *Serm.*, 48; H. ALFORD, *Serm.*, 3, 309; J. J. BLUNT, *Plain Serm.*, 56; W. GRESLEY, *Parochial Serm.*, 365; C. E. KENNAWAY, *Serm. at Brighton*, 1, 222; BISHOP W. NICHOLSON, *On the Apostles' Creed*, 99; J. CAM

ERON, *Opera*, 536; J. WALLIS, *Serm.*, 153; E. BKESTON, *Serm.*, 375; J. EVANS, *Disc.*, 1, 350; J. WESLEY, *Serm.*, *Works*, 5, 98; B. BEDDOME, *Short Disc.*, 8, 151; S. E. PIERCE, *Essay*, &c., 149; C. SIMEON, *Works*, 15, 276; J. H. STEWART, *Serm.*, 189; G. T. NOEL, *Serm.*, 2, 471; W. MUIR, *On the Holy Spirit*, 144; T. AINGER, *Parochial Serm.*, 184, C. NEAT, *Disc.*, 239.

[HOMILETICAL LITERATURE ON THE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT.—J. DONNE, *Works*, 2, 42; I. WATTS, *Evang. Disc.*, *Works*, 2, 292, 302; P. DODDRIDGE, *Serm.*, 2, 378; 3, 1; ARCHBISHOP J. SHARP, *Works*, 5, 1; W. STEPHENS, *Serm.*, 1, 287; BISHOP SHERLOCK, *Disc.*, *Works*, 1, 153; ARCHBISHOP SECKER, *Serm.*, 7, 221; T. RANDOLPH, *The Witness of the Spirit* (1768); *A View*, &c., 2, 223; J. WESLEY, *Serm.*, *Works*, 5, 111; J. DICKINSON, *Sermons and Tracts*; W. HEY, *Tracts*, 487; C. SIMEON, *Works*, 15, 283; W. L. BOWLES, *Paulus*, &c., 103; BISHOP PHILPOTTS, *Orig. Fam. Serm.*, 2, 237; E. COOPER, *Pract. Serm.*, 7, 380; C. W. LE BAS, *Serm.*, 3, 89; S. CLARKE, *Serm.*, 2, 73; *Forty Sermons*, 205; J. PENN, *Serm.*, 2, 125.—HOMILETICAL LITERATURE OF THE GROANING AND TRAVAIL OF CREATION.—N. HOMES, *Resurrection Revealed, Raised above Doubts*; C. E. KENNAWAY, *Serm. at Brighton*, 2, 34; J. H. GURNEY, *Serm.*, 173; J. H. B. MOUNTAIN, *Serm.*, 95; A. LEGER, *Nouveaux Serm.*, 2, 168; H. GROVE, *Posth. Works*, 2, 109; J. WESLEY, *Serm.*, *Works*, 6, 241; R. BALMER, *Lect.*, 2, 507; H. STOWELL, *Serm.* (1845); J. CUMMING, *Voices of the Night* 181; J. C. DANNHAWERUS, *Crit. Sac. Theo.*, 2, 503 E. W. GOULBURN, *Bampton Lect.*, 269; A. HORNECK *Serm.* (1677); A. TOWNSON, *Disc.*, 224; F. H. HUTTON, *Serm.*, 306; W. VICKERS, *Serm.*, 233; J. SLADE, *Plain Serm.*, 7, 76; H. HUGHES, *Serm.*, 107; W. CADMAN, *Bloomsbury Lect.*, 10, 31; W. FENNER, *Works*, 1, 295; T. BOSTON, *Works*, 9, 268, 286; W. CRUDEN, *Serm.*; J. MARTIN, *Remains*, J. GARBETT, *Serm.*, 2, 187; BISHOP WILBERFORCE, *Serm. on Sev. Occ.*, 1; W. RICHARDSON, *Serm.*, 2, 146; T. ARNOLD, *Serm.*, 1, 189; C. MARRIOTT, *Serm.*, 1, 179; R. MONTGOMERY, *God and Man*, 311; E. B. PUSEY, *Serm.*, 2, 304.—J. F. H.]

THIRD DIVISION.

SIN AND GRACE IN THEIR THIRD ANTITHESIS (IN THEIR THIRD POTENCY): HARDENING, AND THE ECONOMIC JUDGMENT OF HARDENING (THE HISTORICAL CURSE OF SIN), AND THE CHANGE OF JUDGMENT TO DELIVERANCE BY THE EXERCISE OF DIVINE COMPASSION ON THE COURSE OF THE WORLD'S HISTORY. THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF SIN TO THE EXECUTION OF JUDGMENT, AND OF THE REVELATION OF SALVATION TO THE EXHIBITION OF COMPASSION. THE INWARD CONJUNCTION OF GOD'S JUDICIAL AND SAVING ACTS, AND THE EFFECTING OF THE SECOND BY THE FORMER.

CHAPTERS IX.–XI.

FIRST SECTION.—*The dark problem of God's judgment on Israel, and its solution.*

CHAP. IX. 1–33.

A.

1 I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in
2 the Holy Ghost, That I have great heaviness [grief] and continual sorrow in
3 my heart. For I could wish[1] that [I] myself[2] were accursed from Christ for
4 my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: Who are Israelites; to whom
pertaineth [whose *is*] the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants,[3] and the
giving of the law, and the service *of God* [*of the sanctuary*], and the promises;
5 Whose *are* the fathers, and of whom as concerning [as to] the flesh Christ *came*
[*is* Christ], who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.[4]

B.

6 Not as though [It is not however so, that][5] the word of God hath taken none
effect [come to nought]. For they *are* not all Israel, which are of Israel [For
7 not all who are of Israel, are Israel]:[6] Neither, because they are the seed of
8 Abraham, *are they* all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called.[7] That is,
They which are the children of the flesh, these *are* not the children of God
[Not those who are the children of the flesh, are children of God]: but the

9 children of the promise are counted for the seed [reckoned as seed]. For this
is the word of promise [this word was of promise], At this time [season][9] will
10 I come, and Sarah shall have a son. And not only *this;*[9] but when Rebecca
11 also had conceived by one, *even* by [omit *even* by] our father Isaac, (For *the*
children being not yet born, neither having [Without their[10] having as yet been
born, or] done any [any thing] good or evil,[11] that the purpose of God according
12 to election might stand, not of works, but of him that [who] calleth;) It was
13 said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger.[12] As it is written,

Jacob have [omit have] I loved,
But Esau have [omit have] I hated.[13]

14 What shall we say then? *Is there* unrighteousness with God? God forbid.
15 For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will [omit will] have mercy,
16 and I will have compassion on whom I will [omit will] have compassion.[14] So
then *it is* not of him that [who] willeth, nor of him that [who] runneth, but of
17 God that [who] sheweth mercy.[15] For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even
for this same [very] purpose have I raised [did I raise] thee up,[16] that I might
shew my power in thee [in thee my power],[17] and that my name might be de-
18 clared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will
have mercy [Therefore on whom he will he hath mercy], and whom he will he
hardeneth.

19 Thou wilt say then unto me, Why [then][18] doth he yet find fault? For
20 who hath resisted [resisteth] his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that
repliest against God? Shall the thing formed [or, moulded, πλάσμα] say to him
21 that formed *it*, Why hast thou made [didst thou make] me thus? Hath not the
potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour
22 and another unto dishonour? *What* [But *what*] if God, [although][19] willing
to shew *his* wrath, and to make his power known [make known his power], en-
dured with much long-suffering the [omit the] vessels of wrath fitted to [for]
23 destruction: And [Also, *i. e.*, he endured for this purpose also][20] that he might make
known the riches of his glory on the [omit the] vessels of mercy, which he had
24 afore prepared unto [before prepared for] glory, Even us, whom he hath called
[As such, *i. e.*, vessels of mercy, he also, besides preparing, called us] not of [from among]
the Jews only, but also of [from among] the Gentiles?

25 As he saith also in Osee [Hosea],[21]

I will call them my people, which [who] were not my people;
And her beloved, which [who] was not beloved. [;]

26 And it shall come to pass,[22] *that* in the place where it was said unto them,
Ye *are* not my people; there shall they be called the children [called sons] of
27 the living God. Esaias also [And Isaiah] also crieth concerning Israel,

Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea,
A [The] remnant[23] shall be saved:
28 For[24] he will finish the work [is finishing the word],[25] and cut [cutting]
it short in righteousness:
Because a short work [word][26] will the Lord make upon the earth.

29 And as Esaias said before [And, as Isaiah hath said],

Except[27] the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed,
We had been [become] as Sodoma [Sodom],
And been made like unto Gomorrah.

30 What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, which followed not [who were
not following] after righteousness, have [omit have] attained to righteousness,
31 even the righteousness which is of faith. But Israel, which followed [follow-
ing] after the law of righteousness, hath not attained [attained not] to the law
32 of righteousness [omit of righteousness].[28] Wherefore? Because *they sought it*
not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law [or, as by works].[29] For[30]
33 they stumbled at that stumbling-stone [stone of stumbling]; As it is written,
Behold,[31] I lay in Sion a stumbling-stone [Zion a stone of stumbling] and [a]
rock of offence: and whosoever believeth [he who believeth][32] on him shall not
be ashamed [put to shame].

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 3.—[Lange renders: *Denn ich that ja (einst) das Gelübde, for I once indeed made the vow to be,* &c. For the full discussion of this interpretation, see *Exeg. Notes.* The English text has not been altered to correspond, since the common view of ηὐχόμην is upheld in the additions.—D. K. L. read εὐχόμην, which is generally rejected.

[2] Ver. 3.—[The *Rec.* has this order: αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι (C. K. L.); but the preponderant authority ℵ. A. B. D. E. F. G.) favors: ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ (ℵ., however, puts εἶναι first). So Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Tregelles, Lange. This order, if it has any special force, probably emphasizes the fact, that he could wish *himself* accursed, rather than that he *himself* could wish it. Hence the Amer. Bible Union is unfortunate in placing *myself* after the first *I.* Noyes: *I could wish to be myself accursed.*

[3] Ver. 4.—[B. D. E. F. G., Vulgate, and most fathers, read: ἡ διαθήκη. ℵ. A. C. K.: αἱ διαθῆκαι, now adopted by most editors. The alteration to the singular probably arose from a misunderstanding of the meaning. The plural was referred to the Old and New Testaments; and as the latter was no advantage of the Jews, the singular was substituted (so Meyer).

[4] Ver. 5.—[Lange considers *God blessed forever, Amen,* a synagogical form, to be put in quotation marks. His exegesis accords better with the E. V. than with Luther's *der da ist Gott über Alles, gelobet in Ewigkeit, Amen.* On the disputed punctuation, see *Exeg. Notes.* Noyes, naturally, puts a period after Christ.

[5] Ver. 6.—[See *Exeg. Notes.*

[6] Ver. 6.—[The antitheses in vers. 6–8 cannot be preserved in the exact form of the Greek, except at the sacrifice of elegance and smoothness. Literally, the whole passage would be: *For not all these of Israel, these* (are) *Israel: neither because they are the seed of Abraham,* (are) *all children, but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, not the children of the flesh,* (are) *these the children of God, but the children of the promise are reckoned as seed.*

[7] Ver 7.—[For convenient reference, the Hebrew text is appended. Gen. xxi. 12: בְּיִצְחָק יִקָּרֵא לְךָ זָרַע. The LXX. is quoted literally here by Paul, and it is an exact translation. The only question of accuracy which can arise, is respecting the force of בְּ, whether it means *through* or *in.* See *Exeg. Notes.* Noyes: "Thy offspring shall be reckoned from Isaac."

[8] Ver. 9.—[This is freely quoted from the LXX., Gen. xviii. 10, 14. The LXX. reads ἐπαναστρέφων ἥξω πρὸς σὲ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον εἰς ὥρας, καὶ ἕξει υἱὸν Σάῤῥα ἡ γυνή σου (ver. 10); but ver. 14 closes, καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σάῤῥα υἱός. The choice of this latter clause was probably for reasons of emphasis, to indicate that the promise was *to Sarah* (Alford), which is the main thought here. The Hebrew phrase כָּעֵת חַיָּה, *when the time (shall be) reviviscent,* occurring in both verses clearly implies what the LXX. expresses: *at this season of the year.* Comp. Gesenius, *Thesaurus,* i. p. 470, Knobel on Gen. xviii. 10.

[9] Ver. 10.—[Οὐ μόνον δέ. The passage is elliptical. On what should be supplied, see *Exeg. Notes.* As the case to be introduced is not strictly of the same kind as that of Sarah, but stronger, *this* is preferable to *so* (Alford, Amer. Bible Union); the former seems to imply the difference more clearly than the latter.

[10] Ver. 11.—[The subject of the participles γεννηθέντων . . . πραξάντων (genitives absolute) is not expressed, "according to well-known classical usage" (Meyer). It is readily supplied, for allusion has been made to the twins, and the history was well known. The rendering given above seems more satisfactory than that of the E. V. It is, in the main, that of Alford.

[11] Ver. 11.—[Instead of κακόν (*Rec.*, D. F. K. L., Wordsworth), φαῦλον is found in ℵ. A. B. and cursives; adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Tregelles, Lange. The former is the more usual word, in contrast with ἀγαθόν; hence, likely to be inserted. *Evil* and *ill* best express the slight difference, since φαῦλος, like *ill,* does does not always imply something immoral, and yet has the same wide range of meaning. It must have a moral signification here, however. (See Alford *in loco.*)

[12] Ver. 12.—[Quoted literally from the LXX., Gen. xxv. 23, except that ὅτι (recitative, sign of quotation) takes the place of καί. Instead of ἐῤῥήθη (*Rec.*), most MSS. have ἐῤῥέθη.

[13] Ver. 13.—[From the LXX., Mal. i. 2, 3; the only variation is, the inversion of the first clause. It reads in the LXX.: ἠγάπησα τὸν Ἰακώβ. The Hebrew text is:

וָאֹהַב אֶת־יַעֲקֹב׃	I loved Jacob,
וְאֶת־עֵשָׂו שָׂנֵאתִי	But Esau I hated.

[14] Ver. 15.—[An exact quotation from the LXX., Exod. xxxiii. 19. The Hebrew of the original passage is of importance in the exegesis. It reads: וְחַנֹּתִי אֶת־אֲשֶׁר אָחֹן וְרִחַמְתִּי אֶת־אֲשֶׁר אֲרַחֵם. Alford thinks ἄν, inserted in LXX., refers to pure mercy; Meyer, and many others, join it with ὅν: "*whomsoever,* in whatever state;" thus describing not merely the mercy, but the choice of its individual objects, as the free act of God; for the emphasis in the relative clause rests on the repeated ὃν ἄν, since ἄν generally has its position after the emphatic word (Kühner, ii. § 457). We are certainly justified in making the relative clauses present instead of future; for the future force of the Hebrew verbs is doubtful, while the Greek verbs (both in LXX. and the text) are present. See *Exeg. Notes.*

[15] Ver. 16.—[The *Rec.*, B[3]. K., read ἐλεοῦντος (from ἐλεέω); ℵ. A. B[1]. D. K. L. ἐλεῶντος (from ἐλεάω). The latter is adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Tregelles; the former by Meyer and Wordsworth. Meyer urges that Paul would not use two forms, one here, and the other in ver. 18 (where the reading ἐλεεῖ is well established, only D[1]. F. G. having ἐλεᾷ), and concludes that ω was substituted for ου through a mistake of the transcriber, and thus readily preserved, since it corresponded with a form in actual use.

[16] Ver. 17.—[Very freely quoted, especially this clause, from LXX., Exod. ix. 16: ἕνεκεν τούτου διετηρήθης, *on this account thou wert preserved.* Εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο is merely a strengthening of the LXX.; but ἐξήγειρά σε seems to be a purposed deviation. The form of the Hebrew הֶעֱמַדְתִּיךָ (Hiphil of עָמַד, *to stand*), *I have caused thee to stand,* is better preserved by Paul's quotation. See *Exeg. Notes,* for discussion of the meaning of all three passages.

[17] Ver. 17.—[Here Paul deviates from LXX., writing δύναμιν instead of ἰσχύν.

[18] Ver. 19.—[There is some confusion about οὖν. B. D. F. insert it in both clauses; *Rec.*, ℵ. A. K. L. omit it the second time. All have it in the first clause, but the position varies. *Rec.*, D. F. K. L. put it before μοι; ℵ. A. B., Tregelles, after. The above rendering adopts it in both clauses.

[19] Ver. 22.—[The participle θέλων is interpreted: *since, because he was willing* (*i. e.*, purposed) or: *although he was willing* (not yet purposing). The latter is adopted by Lange: *obschon (bereits) des Willens;* Meyer, and others.—After *what,* supply: *wilt thou reply?* or something to that effect. See the *Exeg. Notes* on both points.

[20] Ver. 23.—[It was necessary to supply this much in the text, in order to vindicate the view taken of this difficult passage. See *Exeg. Notes.*

[21] Ver. 25.—[This is a free quotation from Hosea ii. 25 (23, LXX. E. V.). The Hebrew text is followed more closely than the LXX.; the clauses are transposed, &c. It is not necessary to insert the LXX. text here, as it differs in almost every word, though containing the same general thought: וְרִחַמְתִּי אֶת־לֹא רֻחָמָה וְאָמַרְתִּי לְלֹא־עַמִּי עַמִּי־אַתָּה. In rendering *Lo-ruhamah,* Paul follows the LXX.

[22] Ver. 26.—[From the LXX., Hosea i. 10 (ii. 1, Hebrew), closely connected with the preceding, as if from the same place, according to the usage of the Rabbins, who thus joined citations even from different authors. The only variation from the LXX. is the strengthening of κληθήσονται καί into ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται. The E. V., Hosea i. 10 supplies *there.*

[23] Ver. 27.—[Isa. x. 22. Paul follows the LXX., which reads: *καὶ ἐὰν γένηται ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ κατάλειμμα αὐτῶν σωθήσεται.* The variation from the Hebrew is slight; יָשׁוּב, *shall return*, is strengthened by the LXX. into σωθήσεται, which, of course, means still more as Paul uses it. א[1]. A. B., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Tregelles, Lange, read ὑπόλειμμα; the more probable reading, as the LXX. differs. It is a stronger word, apparently.

[24] Ver. 28.—[The variations from the Hebrew are so extensive, that it will be best to give the text entire

כִּלָּיוֹן חָרוּץ שׁוֹטֵף צְדָקָה׃
כִּי כָלָה וְנֶחֱרָצָה אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִֹה צְבָאוֹת עֹשֶׂה׃
בְּקֶרֶב כָּל־הָאָרֶץ

"The consumption is decided, overflowing with righteousness;
For a consumption and a decree shall the Lord of Hosts make,
In the midst of all the land."

See *Exeg. Notes* for other renderings, and also for text of the LXX., which Paul quotes closely; inserting γάρ at the beginning, however, as better continuing the proof, and substituting ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς for ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ.

[25] Ver. 28.—[The E. V. is unfortunate in rendering λόγον, *work.* (So Amer. Bible Union.) The word has a wide range of meaning, but this is not included. Lange: *Abrechnungsspruch, word of reckoning.* See *Exeg. Notes.*

[26] Ver. 28.—[The words: ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ· ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον, are wanting in א[1]. A. B., rejected by Lachmann, Tregelles; bracketted by Alford, but retained by most editors on the authority of א[3]. D. F. K. L. The suspicion of an addition from the text of the LXX. is outweighed by the probability of the transcriber's confusing συντετμ. with the συντέμνων.

[27] Ver. 29—[A verbatim citation from the LXX., Isa. i. 9, where the Hebrew שָׂרִיד is rendered σπέρμα.

[28] Ver. 31.—[The *Rec.* (followed by the E. V.) repeats δικαιοσύνης (א[3]. F. K. L.). De Wette, Tholuck, and Meyer contend that the omission would be senseless; see, to the contrary, *Exeg. Notes.* The omission is sustained by א[1]. A. B D. G., Lachmann, Alford, Wordsworth, Lange, Tregelles. Dr. Hodge does not notice any of the variations in these verses.

[29] Ver. 32.—[The authorities for νόμου (*Rec.*) are א[3]. D. K. L., a number of versions. It is omitted, however, in א[1]. A. B. F., by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Lange, Tregelles, Wordsworth. Alford prefers to omit, but does not deem the evidence sufficiently strong to decide. The word would readily be inserted as an explanation.

[30] Ver. 32.—[Lange prefers to retain γάρ (*Rec.*), mainly on the ground that it must be supplied in thought, even if rejected. It is found in א[3]. D[3]. K. L., many versions and fathers; retained by Tischendorf, Wordsworth, Lange. It is omitted in א[1]. A. B. D[1]. F., some cursives, &c. Lachmann, Meyer (with decision), Alford, Tregelles, reject it. If omitted, the period also must be omitted, and the verse be rendered, as by Alford: "*Because* (pursuing it) *not by faith, but as by works, they stumbled,* &c.

[31] Ver. 33.—[Paul here combines Isa. xxviii. 16 and viii. 14 in one, varying, to suit his purpose, both from the Hebrew text and the LXX. There is no variation in thought, except that the Apostle gives it as his exegesis, that the "stone of stumbling" of the one passage is the "corner-stone elect," &c., of the other. Comp. 1 Peter ii. 6–8.

[32] Ver. 33.—[The *Rec.* inserts πᾶς, on the authority of K. L., versions and fathers. It is omitted in א. A. B. D. F., by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer (4th ed.; Lange quotes him as retaining it), Alford, Wordsworth, Lange, Tregelles. It does not occur in the LXX., but, in chap. x. 11, no MS. omits it. The probability is, that it was inserted here to conform to that passage. Lange suggests that the emphasis upon πᾶς, were it retained, would weaken that upon πιστεύων.—R.]

[Preliminary Note *on the whole chapter, and its connection with the rest of the Epistle.*—In order to understand this chapter, which is in many respects the most difficult section of the whole Epistle, its connection with the preceding context, but especially with chaps. x. and xi., must not be overlooked. Before passing from the doctrinal part, which reached its culmination in the song of triumph at the close of chap. viii., to the practical exhortations (chaps. xii. ff.), the Apostle institutes (in chaps. ix.–xi.) a profound inquiry into the historical course of development of the kingdom of God, seeking especially to enlighten and satisfy his readers respecting the enigmatical phenomenon, that the greater part of the people of Israel rejected salvation in Christ.* The thought might readily arise, that the promises given to the covenant-people had to come to nought, or that Jesus was not the Messiah, who had been promised principally to the Jews. After expressing his sorrow at the exclusion of so many of his people from the Christian salvation, he shows:

1. That God's promise was not thereby rendered void; for (*a.*) it refers, not to all of Abraham's descendants, but to those chosen by God of free grace, as Isaac and Jacob (vers. 6–13). (*b.*) God is not unjust in this election, for He is the Sovereign over His creatures, who can make no rightful demands of Him (vers. 14–29).

2. The ground of the exclusion lies in the unbelief of the Jews themselves, who despised the true way of salvation through the righteousness of faith, and substituted their own righteousness; while the gospel announced to them, as indeed the Old Testament frequently indicated, that salvation could be attained only through faith (chap. ix. 30–x. 21).

3. God had not, however, cast off His people; for (*a.*) there is a remnant elected of grace, though most are hardened (chap. xi. 1–10); (*b.*) the unbelief and fall of Israel, in the wisdom and mercy of God, turns out for the salvation and reviving of the Gentiles, who should not, however, boast themselves (chap. xi. 11–24); (*c.*) finally, the rejection is only temporary, since, after the conversion of all the Gentiles, grace will come to the whole of Israel (chap. xi. 25–32). In conclusion, the Apostle breaks forth into a doxology to the grace and wisdom of God, who in such a manner will solve the enigma of the world's history, and lead all things to the glory of His name and the best interest of His kingdom (chap. xi. 33–36).—P. S.]

De Wette on chaps. ix.–xi.: A supplement (!) to the foregoing discussion: lament, explanation and comfort concerning the exclusion of the greater portion of the Jews from Christian salvation. Meyer, likewise: A supplement on the foregoing non-participation of the greater part of the Jews in the Christian institution of salvation, containing: *a.* The lament on it (chap. ix. 1–5). *b.* The theodicy accounting for it (chap. ix. 6–29). *c* The guilt of it

* [His theme, as announced in chap. i. 16, 17, necessarily led him to such an inquiry. It concludes: "to the *Jew first*, and also to the Greek." Having discussed the great truth of "the righteousness of faith," he must justify this additional clause, which seems to be incorrect, in view of the present exclusion of the Jews. So Philippi, and others.—R.]

which rests upon the Jews themselves (chap. ix. 30–33, and chap. x. 1–21). *d.* The consolation arising from it (chap. xi. 1–32), with praise offered to God (chap. ix. 33–36). While De Wette regards the section of chaps. ix.–xi. as only a supplement, Baur considers it the real centre and kernel of the Epistle. If this be so, the kernel would indeed have a very massive shell.

[Forbes (following Olshausen) finds a parallel between chap. i. 18–iii. 20, and these three chapters. "We have here an instance of the Epanodos, the object of which is to bring the main subject into prominence by placing it first and last. In both sections the subject is *the relation of Israel, and of the Gentiles, to the new way of salvation.* But in chap. i. 18–iii. 20 it is regarded more on the side of the *Law*—as condemning Israel equally with the Gentiles, and necessitating them equally to have recourse to the gospel. In chaps. ix.–xi. it is regarded more on the side of *Grace* (on the part of God, as possessing a right to prescribe His own terms of acceptance), and of *Faith* (on the part of man, as the one only condition for attaining salvation, and which is demanded equally of Israel as of the Gentiles). Another point of resemblance between the two sections consists in the striking parallelism between the three objections of the Jew in chap. iii. 1–8, and those in chap. ix. 1–23."—Jowett: "The Apostle himself seems for a time in doubt between contending feelings, in which he first prays for the restoration of Israel, and then reasons for their rejection, and then finally shows that, in a more extended view of the purposes of God, their salvation is included. He hears the echo of many voices in the Old Testament, by which the Spirit spoke to the Fathers, and in all of them there is a kind of unity, though but half expressed, which is not less the unity of his own inmost feelings toward his kinsmen according to the flesh. As himself an Israelite and a believer in Christ, he is full of sorrow first, afterwards of hope, both finally giving way to a clearer insight into the purposes of God toward His people." As respects the relation of these chapters to the preceding part of the Epistle, in an experimental view, Luther well says: "Who hath not known passion, cross, and travail of death, cannot treat of foreknowledge (election of grace), without injury and inward enmity toward God. Wherefore take heed that thou drink not wine, while thou art yet a sucking babe. Each several doctrine hath its own season, and measure, and age."—R.]

Tholuck gives, on pp. 466, 467, a copious catalogue of the literature on Romans ix. See also Meyer, p. 347. We may here call attention to a more recent monograph: Beck, *Versuch einer pneumatisch-hermeneutischen Erklärung des 9te Kap.*, &c., 1838. To this we add the following: C. W. Krummacher, *Das Dogma von der Gnadenwahl, nebst Auslegung des 9te, 10te, und 11te Kap. im Briefe an die Römer*, Duisburg, 1856; Lamping, *Pauli Apostoli de prædestinatione decreta*, Lenwarden, 1858; Delitzsch, *Zur Einl. in den Brief an die Römer. Zeitschrift für die luth. Theologie und Kirche*, 1849, No. 4; Van Hengel mentions (2, 323) Wysuis, *Leerredenen over Romeinen*, ix., x., xi., tom. i. [Philip Schaff, *Das neunte Kapitel des Römerbriefs übersetzt und erklärt*, in the author's *Kirchenfreund*, Mercersburgh, Pa., 1852, pp. 378–389, 414–422, largely used in the exposition of this chapter in the present volume.—R.]

Summary.—A. *The painful contrast between the misery of the Jews and the described salvation of the Christians, most of whom had been Gentiles. The Apostle's sorrow over the apparently frustrated destiny of his people* (vers. 1–5).

B. *The exultation of the Apostle in the thought that God's promise to Israel would nevertheless remain in force* (vers. 6–33). Proof: 1. Differences in *the election:* they are not all Israel which are of Israel (vers. 6–13). 2. Antithesis in the *ordination* (predestination): God is not unrighteous in showing mercy and in hardening, and in His manner of connecting judgment and compassion (vers. 14–18). 3. God's freedom in *the actual call of salvation* (vers. 19–29): *a.* Proof from the existing fact (vers. 19–24); *b.* Proof from the witnesses of the Old Testament (vers. 25–29). 4. The correspondence of God's freedom in His administration, and the freedom of men in their faith or unbelief. The firmness of the fact that the Gentiles believe, and the greater part of Israel do not believe (vers. 30–33).

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

A. *The Apostle's sorrow over the apparently frustrated destiny of his people* (vers. 1–5). Winzer, *Programm in Röm.* ix. 1–5, Lips., 1832.

After the Apostle has portrayed the glory of believers in the New Testament, he must return to the surprising phenomenon, that it is just the majority of the people of the Old Testament who are absent from this feast of salvation—from the Supper of the Lord in the New Testament. The Jews, however, have already come into view (chap. viii. 33) as among the accusers and persecutors, and thus the way has been prepared for this transition. In a systematic reference, the Apostle turns from the consideration of the consummated salvation, to the most extreme contrast—sin in its third potency, the judgment of hardening.

Ver. 1. **I say the truth in Christ** [ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ. Dr. Lange retains the article, as is done in the E. V., and in most revisions (except Noyes'). It seems required by the genius of both the German and English languages.—R.] The Apostle strengthens his subsequent declaration in a threefold way: I say the truth in Christ; I lie not; my conscience bears me witness. The energetic battle which the Apostle waged against the Jews' righteousness of their works, and their claim to prerogatives in God's kingdom, made him odious to the Jews and an object of opposition and suspicion to many prejudiced ones among the Jewish Christians; while biased Gentile Christians might be tempted to regard him as one of their partisans. He meets all this by the solemn asseveration of his pain.

[Alford: "The subject on which he is about to enter, so unwelcome to Jews in general, coupled with their hostility to himself, causes him to begin with a deprecation, bespeaking credit for simplicity and earnestness in the assertion which is to follow. This deprecation and assertion of sympathy he puts in the forefront of the section, to take at once the ground from those who might charge him, in the conduct of his argument, with hostility to his own alienated people."—R.]

But the Apostle treats also of a further great progress in the glorification of Divine grace, which, in its third potency, glorifies as compassion that gloomy judgment of hardening which the Apostle

can only disclose by an expression of the greatest pain. The Apostle is doubly assured of the sincerity of his declaration. First, he expresses his feeling in the consciousness of the fellowship of Christ* (Eph. iv. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 1), while he, so to speak, transfers himself into the feeling of Christ (Luke xix. 41). Second, he proves and tests the truth of his feeling by his conscience, and by the strong and clear light of the Holy Spirit. Now, is this declaration an oath, according to most of the earlier and many of the later expositors (Reiche, Köllner, and others); or is it not, according to the exposition of Tholuck, De Wette, and Meyer? This much is clear, that the Apostle's asseveration is not a formal taking of an oath, and not in the form of an oath. [The form of an oath would be πρός with the accusative.—R.] It will be remembered, in favor of this view, that the ὀμνύειν (Matt. v. 34) is here wanting; and that the Apostle does not swear by Christ, nor by the Holy Ghost. Neither does he swear in a legal sense in general; we may only ask, whether he does not here give a solemn assurance in God's presence, and whether such an assurance is not an ideal oath?

I lie not [οὐ ψεύδομαι]. (1 Tim. ii. 7.) White lies being very much in vogue at the time, this addition surely meant that he was perfectly conscious of his responsibility for his declarations, since he called on Christ as a witness.

My conscience also bearing me witness [συμμαρτυρούσης μοι τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου]. Meyer: *Since my conscience bears me witness.* But Paul's conscience could not bear witness to the Romans apart from Paul himself. The distinction between his own declaration and that of his conscience, means that he has proved his feelings in regard to his people by the light of conscience and of the Spirit of God. [Alford: The σύν in composition, denoting *accordance with* the fact, not *joint testimony.*—R.]

In the Holy Ghost [ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ]. This is not an addition to συνείδησις itself (a conscience governed by the Holy Ghost; Grotius), and still less to οὐ ψεύδομαι (although this is favored by many: ὡς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ὤν), but to συμμαρτ. μοι (Tholuck, Meyer, and others). [Meyer: "Paul knows that the witness of his conscience is not *outside* the Spirit which fills him, but *spirito sancto duce et moderatore* (Beza) in it."—R.]

Ver. 2. **That I have great grief and continual sorrow in my heart** [ὅτι λύπη μοί ἐστιν μεγάλη καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος ὀδύνη τῇ καρδίᾳ μου. The position of the words is solemnly emphatic.—R.] The Apostle does not immediately and directly mention the subject or occasion of his grief. Why not? Meyer: "From tender compassion." Tholuck: "In lively emotion." But the object is indicated by the ὑπὲρ τ. ἀδ. μου (ver. 3), and it is the ἀπώλεια threatened them (ver. 22). But the great pain relates not only to the great fall of his glorious people, which had already occurred, but to the Apostle's tragical position toward his brethren according to the flesh, and to the hard prophetic call now to disclose publicly the whole judgment of hardening pronounced on Israel, with its incalculably sad consequences. Christ also wept as He prophesied Jerusalem's fate. Comp. Isa. vi. [How noble the Apostle appears here, with this holy patriotism and hearty love to those who, from the day of his conversion, had persecuted him with relentless hatred; who, soon after the composition of this Epistle, occasioned him a long imprisonment, and who were the immediate cause of his martyrdom!—P. S.]

Ver. 3. **For I could wish.** [Lange: *Denn ich that ja das Gelübde*, **for I made the vow**]. See the discussions on this difficult passage, quoted by Tholuck. For an elaborate account of the earlier expositions, see Wolf's *Curæ*, iii. p. 164. Explanations of the ηὐχόμην:

1. I have *wished*, namely, formerly (Vulgate: *optabam;* Luther: I have wished). This explanation divides, again, into two:

a. When I was a Jew, I wished to keep the Jews far from Christ; yea, to be myself the personal medium of the alienation; ἀνάθεμα = χωρισμός (Pelagius, Abelard, and others). In this case he appeals to his former blind zeal for Israel against Christ, in order to prove that he loves his people, and, in his love, that he now sorrows for their fate.

b. In my pain I have gone so far, as a Christian, that I wished, &c. (*Significat, se aliquando hoc orasse, nimirum cum dolor iste singulariter invaluisset*) Bucer. Meyer, and others, suggest, to the contrary, that there is here no ποτέ, or any other word of similar import. Philippi adds: it must then mean ηὐξάμην ποτέ.*

2. I wished, namely, even now.

a. Tholuck: *Dum modo fieri posset, si liceret.*

b. Meyer: I would wish, if the import of my wish could contribute to the good of the Israelites.

c. Philippi: But ηὐχόμην is also not identical with ηὐχόμην ἄν; that is, *I would wish*, if the wish were possible; but since it is not possible, I do not wish. But it is = *I wished*, namely, if the wish could be realized, and therefore really wish on this supposition.

The difference between the explanations is this: *a.* If the wish were possible (Tholuck); *b.* If the thing wished for were possible (Philippi); *c.* If the thing wished for, and also the wish itself, were possible (Meyer). There has, perhaps, not been enough regard to analogies in Paul's method of expression. Paul says ηὐξαίμην ἄν (Acts xxvi. 29), for *I wished*, in the sense of *I would wish*, and why not here, too? Luke relates, on the contrary, Acts xxvii. 29, in the imperfect: ηὔχοντο, they wished (at that time); and why should not the imperfect be used here in the same sense? If, indeed, the word should mean here, I have *wished*, or even, I have *prayed* (Theodoret, and others), the presence of ποτέ might be insisted upon. But if the Apostle wishes to say, *I made a vow*—*i. e.*, if he speaks of a definite fact—the ποτέ lies already in the emphasis of the ηὐχόμην itself, especially as joined with the added

* [". . . Christ," *i. e.*, in fellowship with Christ, who is Truth itself, and transfers His members, at all events, into the element of truth and sincerity (comp. 2 Cor. xii. 19).—P. S.]

* [Under (1) belongs an interpretation, suggested by the venerable S. H. Cox, D. D., taking the verse as a parenthetical explanation of Paul's sorrow, in this sense: "*for* I myself once *gloried* as a persecutor to be banished from Christ." Besides the objections against the past sense as given above, it may be added, that this puts *myself* in the wrong place (see *Textual Note*[3]); that, while εὔχομαι has this meaning: to *boast*, to *glory*, in Homer, yet even there it is often little more than to *profess, maintain*, while in the New Testament it does not occur in this sense. The probabilities, both lexical and grammatical, are very strong, therefore, against such a meaning here.—R.]

αὐτὸς ἐγώ. It is very probable that he made some pledge, when he (according to Acts ix. 2) received from the high priest authority to persecute the Christians; for a hierarch of exalted station does not confide in a young man without some such pledges. His present perception of the fearful import of that engagement is immediately expressed in ἀνάθεμα, κ.τ.λ.

If we disregard such an acceptation, the exegetical difficulty will really begin with ἀνάθεμα. [Dr. Lange prefers, yet does not commit himself to, this view of the imperfect. It is far-fetched; and were there no other grounds to influence the interpretation than those of grammar, as Alford hints, any school-boy could tell that the imperfect does not refer to a definite past act, but represents "the act unfinished, an obstacle intervening." In support of the grammatical correctness of this view, see Buttman, *N. T. Gramm.*, p. 187; Kühner, ii., § 433, 3; Bernhardy, *Syntax*, p. 373; Kruger, § 54, 10; Winer, p. 266. It seems perilous to give up the obvious meaning, *I could wish*, for one barely allowable. The aorist was at hand, if Paul wished to refer to a past vow. If there be a difficulty in the passage, it is met most fairly by Meyer's view, that the verb implies an impossibility, or at least an insurmountable obstacle, both as to the wish and the thing wished for. We can then take ἀνάθεμα in its obvious sense, without putting it also on the rack to extort another meaning. See the final *Exeg. Note* on this verse.—R.]

That I myself were accursed from Christ [ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ]. Ἀνάθεμα, Attic ἀνάθημα, *dedicated to God;* hence, also, dedicated to the Divine judgment, and consequently to ruin; in the latter sense = חֵרֶם (Gal. i. 8, 9; 1 Cor. xii. 3; xvi. 22). Though the later sense of חרם "must not be construed as the Jewish curse of excommunication" (Meyer), yet the theocratic idea: to excommunicate from the Church of God, and to dedicate to ruin, cannot be separated. In the Christian sphere the ἀνάθεμα is, indeed, in the ecclesiastical form, a temporally qualified exclusion: "for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved" (1 Cor. v. 5).

[Excursus on Anathema.—The proper understanding of this passage may be furthered by discussing at this point the precise meaning of the word ἀνάθεμα. The following dissertation is from Wieseler, *Commentary on Galatians* (i. 8, 9, pp. 39 ff.). The fact that it is founded upon another passage, adds to its weight in determining the meaning here, since the discussion of Gal. i. 8 is not beset with the prejudices which arise here.

"Ἀνάθεμα* is the Hellenistic form for the Attic ἀνάθημα (comp. εὕρημα and εὕρεμα, πρόσθημα, and πρόσθεμα, Lobeck, *Ad Phrynich*, p. 249, and *Paralip*, pp. 391 ff.), and, like the latter form, denotes in general 'something dedicated to God, a votive offering;' but in the Bible it is usually the translation of the Hebrew חֵרֶם, as ἀναθεματίζειν is of הֶחֱרִים, and then denotes something dedicated to God in a bad sense, as we shall presently see more particularly; comp. the Latin *sacer*. When any thing consecrated in a general sense is to be denoted, however, the form ἀνάθημα, in the Scriptures and their dependent literature, is wont to prevail; in the other case, the form ἀνάθεμα, although the genuine reading, on account of the divergence of manuscripts, is often very difficult to determine. Ἀνάθημα as translation of חֵרֶם is found, *e. g.*, in the LXX., Levit. xxvii. 28, 29, where, however, the reading ἀνάθεμα also appears. At all events, this use of ἀνάθημα is the exception throughout, as appears also from the fact that ἀναθηματίζειν is nowhere used, but ἀναθεματίζειν. We are more apt to find ἀνάθεμα also in the sense of a customary votive offering; *e. g.*, 2 Macc. ii. 13, and Judith xvi. 19, *Codex Alex.* Luke uses ἀνάθημα, Luke xxi. 5 (yet Cod. A. and D. [so ℵ.], and also Lachmann, read ἀνάθεμα) of a customary votive offering, and Acts xxiii. 14, ἀνάθεμα, of a consecration in a bad sense. Suidas therefore says, with essential correctness: ἀνάθεμα καὶ τὸ ἀνατιθέμενον τῷ θεῷ καὶ τὸ εἰς ἀφανισμὸν ἐσόμενον ἀμφότερα σημαίνει· λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἀνάθημα τὸ τῷ θεῷ ἀνατεθειμένον. [ἀνάθεμα signifies both that which is hung up as an offering to God, and that which is destined to destruction; but that which is hung up as an offering to God is called also ἀνάθημα.] So Theodoret, respecting the usage of his time on Rom. ix. 3: τὸ ἀνάθεμα διπλῆν ἔχει τὴν διάνοιαν· καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἀφιερώμενον τῷ θεῷ ἀνάθημα ὀνομάζεται, καὶ τὸ τούτου ἀλλότριον τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει προσηγορίαν. [The word ἀνάθεμα has a twofold sense: for both that which is consecrated to God is named ἀνάθημα, and the contrary of this has the same appellation.] So much respecting the distinction between ἀνάθεμα and ἀνάθημα."

"The ἀνάθεμα in the passage before us has been understood principally (1.) of excommunication.* So Grotius, Semler, Burger (waveringly), Rosenmüller, Flatt; the *rationalismus vulgaris* in the well-known Bremen controversy occasioned by F. W. Krummacher's *Gastpredigt*, upon this passage, represented by Paniel, Weber, and Paulus (comp. Gildemeister, *passim*, and also Baumgarten-Crusius). Either an actual excommunication was understood, as by Rosenmüller (*excludatur e cœtu vestro*), which Flatt thinks possible with regard to a teacher, or it was even explained as by Grotius (*cum eo nihil vobis sit* COMMERCII, *non magis, quam eum iis quos Synagoga aut Ecclesia penitus abscidit*) and by Semler (*fugite, abhorrete talem doctorem*); in which case we should at least have expected ὥσπερ ἀνάθεμα (ὥσπερ ὁ ἀναθεματισμένος) ἔστω ὑμῖν; comp Matt. xviii. 17."

"In particular in recent times, it is explained (2.) almost universally and also correctly: 'to have

* ["Respecting excommunication among the Jews, comp. especially Selden, *De jure nat. et gent.*, 4, 8, *De Synedr.*, i. 7 and 8; *Gildemeister, Blendwerke des vulgären Rationalismus zur Beseitigung des paulinischen Anathema*, 1841, and *Beiträge zum Bremischen Magazine*, 1842; Ewald, *Alterthümer des Volks Israel*, S. 81 ff.; respecting the Greek ἀνάθεμα, Fritzsche on Rom. ix. 3; also Tholuck on Rom. ix. 3; and on the general subject, Winer, *Realwörterbuch* under *Bann.*"—R.]

* ["Morus even assumes a *wider* signification of ἀνάθεμα ἔστω: *tangat eum* MALUM, POENA, *male ei sit, non definite nunc morte plectendus, an excommunicandus an* ALIO MODO *damnandus.* For this imaginary signification he appeals to Gal. v. 10, where it is said of the same false teacher: *judicium feret*—*i. e.*, 'He will soon find his reward.' Burger, who wavers between this explanation and that of Grotius and Semler, thinks that Paul in both cases meant: *talem hominem perquam esse scelestum atque adeo puniendum, non vero indicare*, QUANAM *sit pœna plectendus.* We see, in the case of the ἀνάθεμα, how thoroughly the unscientific exegesis of all times and all places is dependent on all the wishes and prejudices of the individual."—R.]

become obnoxious to the wrath or curse of God;' Winer, Schott, Rückert, De Wette, Usteri, Meyer, Gildemeister; so that, therefore, Luther, with his: '*der sei verflucht*,' according to Krummacher's interpretation, is justified. Luther would be right also in the main matter, according to Olshausen's assertion, which he presents without proof, and which stands midway between Nos. 1 and 2, that in this formula (3.) we are not *merely* to understand ecclesiastical excommunication, but that this is only *so far included* in the signification as it presupposes Divine reprobation."

"All these explanations, notwithstanding their divergences, proceed from the correct assumption that this ἀνάθεμα is the translation of the Hebrew חֵרֶם. The question is therefore this, what this חֵרֶם among the Jews was, and whether it denoted —*i. e.*, in the time of Paul—the Jewish excommunication. If the latter were disproved, Nos. 1 and 3 would fall; but if this should really be the case, the question would be whether ἀνάθεμα *here* is used of excommunication, or of what it is used. But, in the first place, it is clear that, in the *whole Old Testament*, חֵרֶם and הֶחֱרִים are never used of excommunication. Indeed, they are used with at least as frequent reference to the idolatrous apostasy of the *heathen* nations, especially of Canaanitish ones, as with reference to idolatry and impiety *within* Israel. חֵרֶם is used of every thing, *person* or *thing*, which, on account of its worthiness of death, founded in God's Word—the thing usually in connection with, and on account of, its impious *possessor*—was, whether of free resolve, or at the express command of God, *consecrated* to Jehovah, without capability of *being ransomed;* Levit. xxvii. 21, 28. The *person* who had become a חֵרֶם might not continue to live; Levit. xxvii. 29; and only the thing—to which class, according to ancient view, the slave also belonged—could, if a living creature, remain alive, falling then forever to Jehovah—that is, to the priests; Levit. xxvii. 28; Num. xviii. 14; Ezek. xliv. 29. From this it arises, that הֶחֱרִים, as to its sense, signifies simply 'to destroy,' and is not seldom connected with לְפִי חָרֶב (comp. the Hebrew קָדֵשׁ, which also originally signifies 'to be holy;' Exod. xxix. 37; xxx. 29; and חֵרֶם is rendered in the LXX. not simply by ἀνάθεμα, or ἀφόρισμα, Ezek. xliv. 29, but also by ἀφάνισμα, Deut. vii. 2; ἐξολόθρευμα, 1 Sam. xv. 21; and ἀπώλεια, Isa. xxxiv. 5. From this it appears that, according to the Old Testament, הֶחֱרִים neither literally nor by derived use can signify excommunication, as *exclusion* from the fellowship of the *chosen* people. Nay, the latter is expressly mentioned, Ezra x. 28; but the verb חָרַם is not used of the excommunicated persons, but, in contrast with it, the verb בָּדַל; the former verb, on the other hand, is used in its true sense (see above) of their *property*, because this escheated forever to the sanctuary. Had the הֶחֱרִים been decreed against the *persons* in question on the part of the Jewish assembly, they would thereby not have been excommunicated, but *destroyed* in honour of the God whom they had outraged. On the other hand, in the *Talmud*, חֵרֶם is unquestionably used formally of *excommunication*. According to Elias Levita, the three grades of excommunication among the Jews have not seldom been assumed as (1.) the נִדּוּי, (2.) the חֵרֶם, and (3.) the שַׁמְתָּא. Paniel and Weber also assumed them, asserting that only the highest grade, as the Shammatha, was conjoined with those 'fearful curses' which we read in the Talmudists, but that Paul, with his ἀνάθεμα, meant no other than the חֵרֶם. On the other hand, Gildemeister, *passim*, preceded by Selden, and others, has lately thoroughly demonstrated anew that the Talmud and the Jews, by those three names, do not designate three different grades of excommunication, but that the Shammatha is only another word (the Chaldaic translation) for Niddui; that, therefore, if the Apostle, by his ἀνάθεμα, meant the Cherem as excommunication, the highest grade of excommunication — that accompanied with these 'curses'—must have been meant."

"The next question is, therefore, whether the Cherem, as excommunication, already existed among the Jews *at the time when the Epistle to the Galatians* * *was written*. Although the primitive history of Jewish excommunication is veiled in great obscurity, we certainly shall not err if we ascribe to it, from its first documentarily attested appearance under Ezra (Ezra x. 8), up to the time of Paul, a certain course of development, and that a more extensive one than Gildemeister appears to do."

"According to New Testament testimony there were, then, the two grades of excommunication: (1.) The exclusion from the worship in the Temple and synagogue, John ix. 22; xii. 42; xvi. 2; and (2.) what, as it was already practised under Ezra, can least surprise us, the expulsion † from the congregation of the people, Luke vi. 29 (ἀφορίζειν), which concluded with obliteration of the name in the δέλτοις δημοσίοις (ἐκβάλλειν τὸ ὄνομα ὡς πονηρόν, *l. c.*); which latter circumstance is here expressly added, that the hearers may not understand the *excommunicatio minor*. Quite as certainly, however, is the Jewish excommunication at Paul's time not yet designated as *Cherem*, which even antecedently is improbable, on account of the above developed Old Testament use of חֵרֶם, which could only gradually, and after a longer time, be so considerably modified. For in the *Mishna*, where excommunication is largely handled, Cherem is as yet *never* used of excommunication, but this is denoted by Niddui; it is in the *Gemara* that Cherem appears as excommunication, and that the sharpest form of the same—that joined with fearful 'curses' having reference to *everlasting* destruction, from whence also its name—is explained. With this alone agrees, moreover, the *New Testament* use of ἀνάθεμα and ἀναθεματίζειν, Rom. ix. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 3; xvi. 22; Gal. i. 8, 9; Acts xxiii. 12; xiv. 21; Mark xiv. 71, which in *none* of these passages signify excommunication, or to excommunicate. On the other hand, ἀνάθεμα, in entire congruity with the Old Testament Cherem, is used of a *person* who is dedicated to God, subjected to the *Divine curse* for his *death*,

* [The Epistle to the Romans was written but a year or two afterwards. See Introd., pp. 14, 40.—R.]

† ["If Paul, by the ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, 1 Cor. v. 13, with which he enjoins the excommunication of the incestuous person—comp. 1 Cor. v. 2—alludes, as is commonly assumed, to the technical expression of Deuteronomy: וּבִעַרְתָּ הָרָע מִקִּרְבֶּךָ, and the translation of it in the LXX.; Deut. xvii. 7, xxi. 22 *et. al.*, this term must, at the time of Paul, have been already understood among the Jews not of the death penalty, but of excommunication; comp. Winer, *Bibl. Realwörterbuch*, under *Lebensstrafe*, ii. p. 12."—R.]

not, however, to bodily, as in the more ancient formula—which reference, however, was not necessarily contained in the root, but resulted only from the historical relations of the Jews in ancient time —but to spiritual and eternal death. The ἀνάθεμα, 1 Cor. xvi. 22, cannot signify excommunication, since otherwise it would be denounced against a *temper of mind*, the οὐ φιλεῖν; nor yet 1 Cor. xii. 3, since no one could have wished to excommunicate Jesus, no longer dwelling on earth; nor Rom. ix. 3, as appears sufficiently from the defining ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. In the case of the *verb* ἀναθεματίζειν, indeed, it has not yet come into any one's head, in respect to the New Testament passages, that it signifies, to excommunicate; but ἀναθεμ. ὅτι, Mark, *l. c.*, signifies, 'under self-imprecations (by his soul's salvation) to attest, that;' ἀναθεματίζειν ἑαυτόν, Acts, *l. c.*, 'under self-imprecations to oblige himself.' Quite as little can ἀνάθεμα, Gal. i. 8, 9, be used of excommunication, on this account, if no other, because one cannot excommunicate an angel from heaven (ver. 8), but can very well call down God's curse of damnation upon him, in the ἀνάθεμα. Ver. 9 must have been used in the same sense as in ver. 8. Independently of the subjective participation expressed by the imperative, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω expresses neither more nor less than Gal. v. 10, where Paul denounces against *the same* false teachers the *judgment of God* at the end of days; comp. 2 Thess. i. 9. In form, as in meaning, the Pauline ἀνάθεμα ἔστω (or ἤτω, 1 Cor. xvi. 22) reminds us strongly of the ארור, LXX.: ἐπικατάρατος, Deut. xxvii. 15 ff.; only that not *every* ארור in the Old Testament needs, like our ἀνάθεμα, to be taken as invoking the highest and most intensive evil—eternal damnation—but may very well, according to the connection, be used of that; comp. Gal. iii. 13; Matt. xxv. 41; it being, of course, understood that, by the ἀνάθεμα, the loss of eternal life and the blessed fellowship of God is meant to be invoked against the sinner, only so far and so long as he persists in his wickedness, or this in its nature is irremissible. As to the rest, when Rückert and Schott, in the case of the ἀνάθεμα in this passage, will have it that it does not mean excommunication, for the additional reason that that age was not yet acquainted with this among the Christians, this assertion is unquestionably erroneous; 1 Cor. v. 2 ff.: 1 Tim. i. 20; 3 John 10; Jude 22; comp. Matt. xviii. 17, 18; 2 Thess. iii. 14; 2 John x. 11. The Church fathers afterwards used the ἀνάθεμα, doubtless deriving the use through the Pauline passages, of Christian excommunication, similarly as the Jews their חרם, but these commonly misunderstood the proper sense of this expression. Comp. the criticism of them in Fritzsche, *l. c.*, tom. ii., p. 249, *Note*."

With this well-established view of the meaning of our word, we can pass to the exegesis of this passage, remembering that the burden of proof now rests with those who, to avoid difficulties, assign any other meaning than that so ably defended by Wieseler.—R.]

Meyer: "The destruction to which Paul would commit himself for his brethren must not be understood as a *violent death* (Jerome, Limborsch, Flatt, and others), but as the eternal ἀπώλεια, as is required by the ἀπὸ τ. Χ. It has often been objected that the wish of this ἀπώλεια is unreasonable, and Michaelis even says that it would be a *raving* prayer. But the standard of selfish (!) reflection does not harmonize with the emotion of boundless self-denial and love in which Paul here speaks." (Comp. Chrysostom and Bengel *in loco*.) Tholuck quotes Chrysostom's expression on this point, and adds: "Thus interpret the vast majority of expositors of ancient and modern times, even the Socinians, with Socinus himself." We nevertheless hold unhesitatingly that the explanation of Michaelis is more admissible than Meyer's well-nigh unmeaning overstraining of the idea of self-denial.

The justifiable hesitation in accepting the explanation, that Paul wished to be eternally cast out from Christ—that is, given over to the devil, to be damned—has led to mitigations of the real meaning of the ἀνάθεμα. It has been interpreted:

1. *As temporal death*, as already mentioned. Analogies in 2 Cor. xii. 15: the death of Christ as κατάρα (Jerome, Nösselt, and others). Tholuck, on the other hand: With temporal death as Cherem, there is connected the accursing, which is additionally comprised here in ἀπό τ. χ.

2. *Banishment from church fellowship* (Grotius, and others; apparently, Luther also).

On the controversies arising from a sermon by Fr. Krummacher on Gal. i. 8, in regard to this explanation, comp. Tholuck, p. 471 ff. There is, now, no question that the supposition of an exclusion to injury is always connected with a true exclusion from church fellowship. But if we explain the Old Testament Cherem and the ecclesiastical ban according to the New Testament—that is, specifically according to the words quoted from 1 Cor. v. 5—then it becomes evident that the Old Testament Cherem did not declare *eternal* condemnation when it declared extermination from the congregation of the people, and that devotion to eternal condemnation could never have been the meaning of an authorized ecclesiastical Christian ban. If the explanation, *I wished to be accursed from Christ*, were therefore correct, it would nevertheless not be the same as: I wished to be eternally damned; but: I would be willing to be cast into boundless misery for the brethren.* From the overstrained interpretation of the *accursed*, it would follow, *that the Apostle regarded the brethren in question as eternally damned*. See, on the contrary, Rom. xi.—Tholuck refers to the Jewish and Arabic manner of speaking: May we be thy ransom; may my soul be the redemption of thine! Evidently, hyperboles of Oriental politeness. He cites the reference of Origen to the example of Moses (Exod. xxxii. 32): Paul has spoken like Moses, says Origen: *devotione, non prævaricatione*. But Moses spoke thus at a moment of the deepest emotion, and just as Moses, in the Old Testament sense of the theocratic judgment of reprobation. Jerome takes the value of many souls against one into account; Cyril accepts a hyperbole; and Thomas Aquinas distinguishes between a *separatio a damnatis per culpam* and a *separatio a fruitione gloriæ*.† Tholuck remarks, that Fenelon

* [So Hodge, who, while advocating the common interpretation, would make the meaning very general, and the words express not "definite ideas," but "strong and indistinct emotions."—R.]

† [There seems to be some abstract ground for this distinction. The first, separation from Christ's *holy will*, is opposed to love to Christ and striving after sanctification; it is godless, and, of course, excluded here. The second, separation from the *enjoyment of Christ*, is not in itself immoral, yet can, indeed, be distinguished from the first only abstractly and in thought, being also inaccessible, as

has referred to this passage in order to defend the mystical idea of *amour désinteressé*,* and that Bossuet replies, by saying, that fellowship with God cannot be separated from participation in saving blessings (salvation). Yet Tholuck returns at last to Fenelon's distinction, after quoting many other theological explanations (Calvin: *eruptio animi confusi;* later moralists, especially Dannhauer, Spener, and Bengel: *virtus heroica*). Most expositors, by their reference to the hypothetical *si fieri posset*, return to the acceptance of a hyperbolical expression.

The αὐτὸς ἐγώ leads us back to the simplest rendering.

The current explanation is incorrect at the very outset. Meyer is nearest right: The antithesis is the brethren, the majority of whom are seen by Paul as ἀνάθεμα ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ going to the ἀπώλεια. In this case the ἐγώ would still be superfluous. Our present expression refers to the αὐτὸς ἐγώ (chap. vii. 25). We have seen how the expression there designated the opposition of spiritual and carnal life in the identity of the same individuality. And thus it denotes here the antithesis of his earlier and of his present standpoint, in the identity of an individuality which, at that time, acted from a love for Israel.† *For I even pledged myself, I, the same Paul who must now pronounce the following judgment on Israel*, &c.—His former wish to destroy the Christians by means of the Cherem, he now denominates in its true meaning: to be accursed, ἀπὸ τοῦ Χ., away from Christ; as he is not aware of any other ban from the Church of God than banishment from Christ. Nösselt, and others, have understood by the expression, that Christ would be the author of the ban; which would increase the harshness of the expression. With our view, the ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου can only mean this: *for my brethren*, as one zealous for their interests. Even with the opposite view, Meyer explains ὑπέρ as *for the good of;* but Tholuck, on the contrary, says that the idea of substitution underlies the ὑπέρ, at least indirectly. [Olshausen makes ὑπέρ = ἀντί.—R.] This would render the idea still more intolerable. Paul would not venture to utter the thought, that his ruin might still bring salvation to the people for whom even the death of Christ brought no salvation.

[The interpretations of this difficult passage may be classified as follows:

(1.) Those which take ηὐχόμην in the past sense. The *grammatical* objection to this is so decided, that, unless the gravest difficulties attend every other view, it must be rejected. The view of Dr. Lange, which makes it equivalent to a definite aorist, is grammatically less admissible than that which takes it as = *optabam*, I was wont to wish.

(2.) Those which give to ἀνάθεμα some less strong sense than *accursed, devoted to destruction*. Dr. Lange has cited most of these. The least objectionable among these is that which interprets the word as meaning: untold misery, not necessarily eternal. The *lexical* objection here is very strong; see Excursus above. If Wieseler's statements are reliable, all of these are necessarily excluded. There remains, then,

(3.) The obvious meaning, *I could wish myself devoted to destruction from Christ for my brethren's sake;* implying either that the wish was not formed, because it was impossible to wish, or of impossible fulfilment; ὑπέρ, involving, not necessarily substitution, yet such a suffering for the benefit of others as would turn to their corresponding advantage; for Paul often speaks of what he does *for* (ὑπέρ) his readers. The question then arises, Are the difficulties attending this view so great, that it must be abandoned for such doubtful exegesis as (1.) and (2.) present? Dr. Lange objects:

(*a.*) That it implies a senseless overstraining of the idea of self-denial. But who shall put the limit? "It is the expression of an affectionate and self-denying heart, willing to surrender all things—even, if it might be so, eternal glory itself—if thereby he could obtain for his beloved people those blessings of the gospel which he now enjoyed, but from which they were excluded. Others express their love by professing themselves ready to give their life for their friends: he declares the intensity of his affection by reckoning even his spiritual life not too great a price, if it might purchase their salvation" (Alford). Surely we dare not let our assumption of how far his self-denial would go, limit words, which, if they do not mean this, have always borne this as their obvious meaning.

(*b.*) It is further objected, that then the Apostle would regard the brethren in question as eternally damned. But it is Paul who says that those out of Christ are already perishing (1 Cor. i. 18); and Christ himself speaks of the wrath of God abiding on men (John iii. 18, 36). This objection sunders too widely the present and the future state of unbelievers. Paul would, at all events, feel the power

least in permanency. For holiness and blessedness are inseparable, and it is the *will of Christ* that we become *blessed* through fellowship with Him.—P. S.]

* [Compare Madame Guion (died 1717):

"I consent that thou depart,
Though thine absence breaks my heart,
Go, then, and forever, too;
All is right that thou wilt do."

"My last, least offering, I present thee now—
Renounce me, leave me, and be still adored!
Slay me, my God, and I applaud the blow."

Cowper's Translation.

The doctrine of disinterested affection has been supported in America by Samuel Hopkins, D.D., and his system is commonly called Hopkinsianism. He holds that self-love, which cannot be distinguished from selfishness in his view, "is the root and essence of all sin;" that holiness consists in disinterested benevolence. He makes the possession of this benevolence a test of religion and religious exercises, and says, that though a benevolent person "could know that God designed, for His own glory and the general good, to cast him into endless destruction, this would not make him cease to approve of His character; he would continue to be a friend of God, and to be pleased with His moral perfections." (*System of Doctrines*, 2d ed., Boston, 1811, i. p. 479.) But he puts certain limitations respecting proper personal interest, and nowhere implies that one must reach this point of experience in order to be converted. The current opinion of his view is, that he teaches: "a man must be willing to be damned, in order to be saved"—a logical sequence which he does not affirm. Nor does he quote this passage, which would seem to favor his position. It is probable that he, too, would admit the impossibility of such a wish being granted, and claim no other meaning for this passage than that which many of the most judicious commentators adopt, and which is the most literal and obvious one. It may well be held that Paul reached such a pitch of feeling as this, without insisting that this is the constant and conscious state of the Christian heart.—R.]

† [This obviates one difficulty, urged by Dr. Hodge, against the sense *I wished:* "No Jew would express his hatred of Christ and his indifference to the favors which He offered, by saying he wished himself accursed from Christ." But it makes the grammatical difficulty still greater. An imperfect is made to do service not only as an aorist, but in a sense very unusual; while what is closely joined with it —viz., the purport of the wish or vow—derives its significance from the present standpoint. Extremely doubtful, to say the least!—R.]

of the future state of retribution in the case of these brethren, just to the extent that he attached a definite meaning to ἀνάθεμα; so that this objection is of no weight.

(*c.*) The implication suggested above, that Paul then would deem his ruin more powerful than the death of Christ, involves the strongest meaning of ὑπέρ. If the idea of substitution be excluded, this objection falls to the ground. But if Paul could not use ὑπέρ here, in the sense that his sufferings might produce certain beneficial results to others, he could not use it elsewhere in the same sense (Eph. iii. 13; Col. i. 24 twice). The objection, in any case, lies not against the degree, but the quality of the suffering.

(*d.*) Lange characterizes the current interpretation as *hyperbolical*. If it be, then objection (*a.*) has no weight, for a hyperbole would not overstrain the idea of self-denial. But this interpretation is not strictly a hyperbole. For Paul wished by this to express a degree of feeling which could be measured in human expression by nothing less strong than this. The objective impossibility did not destroy the subjective intensity of feeling. And although he may not have actually formed the wish, still any student of human nature knows that feelings often exist, never taking shape in definite wish, which are contrary both to what is possible and what is actually wished. The expression is, however, truthful in Paul's consciousness, hence not a hyperbole.

On the whole, the objections to this view (3.) seem of so much less weight, that the majority of commentators adopt it. Besides the grammatical and lexical grounds in its favor, it presents the great Apostle to the Gentiles under the influence of feelings most akin to the self-sacrificing love of the Lord he preached. And it detracts nothing from our estimate of his affection to know, as he did also, that such love flowed only from his love to Christ, his fellowship with Christ, which would itself change hell to heaven.—R.]

My kinsmen according to the flesh [τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα]. This addition expresses both his former motive and his continued patriotic feeling (see chap. xi. 14).* [There is, however, here an implied antithesis to "brethren in the Lord." Paul's patriotism is here justified, but, as the next verse shows, it has a deeper ground in the gracious gifts and religious advantages which the Jews had hitherto enjoyed.—R.]

Ver. 4. **Who are Israelites.** Οἵτινες.—*Quippe qui.* Thus he announces the characteristics of his kindred "according to the flesh," who lay so near his heart, and the decline of whose glory excited his profound compassion. The collective glory of the Jews lies in the fact that they are Israelites—that they bear the honorable name of Israel, as those who are called, like their ancestor, to be a people of God consisting of wrestlers with God—a people of wrestling prayer. [It should be remarked here, that the ground of the prerogatives afterwards enumerated was the free grace of God, not any superior natural excellence of this people as compared with the heathen. This is implied in the very character of the prerogatives. Besides, in calling them "Israelites," there is a direct reference to the fact that their advantages grew out of their relation to one directly chosen of God. So that the very glory of Israel shows the sovereignty of God, toward which the chapter points, in discussing the enigma of the present position of this favored people.—R.]

By a rhetorically forcible καί, καί, &c., Paul now discloses six prerogatives, from υἱοθεσία to ἐπαγγελίαι, after which he extols the highest glory of the Israelites—that the fathers belong to them, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ also came.

He calls them *Israelites*, and not merely Israel (see ver. 6). Although the majority of the people turned away from Christ, and but a minority identified themselves with Him, this minority nevertheless constitutes, *par excellence*, the people of Israel. See the τινές in chap. iii. 3, and also chap. xi. 1. He can, indeed, call also the unbelieving majority "Israel" in a qualified sense (ver. 31). But the name "Israelites" is still placed as the name of honor at the very head of the advantages (see 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5; John i. 47). On the use of the name in Josephus, see Tholuck, p. 476.

Tholuck's division of the advantages into three pairs is well grounded; but he is less warranted in regarding them as designations of their theocratic *honor*, their theocratic *basis*, and their theocratic *hope*, "to which the prerogatives of the fathers of the theocracy, and of their head, is connected as a fourth member." According to the import of the designations, the υἱοθεσία indicates, at the outset, the whole state of honor; then the first pair describes the patriarchal foundation, including the new calling of Israel as a people; the second pair, on the contrary, set forth the Mosaic legal constitution of Israel; then, again, the ἐπαγγελίαι, "*the promises*," denotes the collective transition from Moses to Christ by the prophets. To these real advantages of Israel there then corresponds the antithesis of personal advantages: the true fathers of the people down to Christ.

Whose is the adoption [ὧν ἡ υἱοθεσία] God's acceptance in the place of a child, adoption; yet not in the sense of the New Testament realization, but in that of the Old Testament typification (see Exod. iv. 22 ff.; Deut. xiv. 1; xxxii. 6; Hosea xi. 1; Rom. viii. 1, 2). The foundation of this adoption was the election, calling, and sealing of Abraham. But in this right of the child there was not merely comprised the real enjoyment of "theocratic protection," but also the foundation and guidance to real adoption (Gal. iv. 1, 2); and, in relation to the promise for the remaining nations, the determination that Israel should be the first-born son of God (Exod. iv. 22) [It therefore comprises, though only germinally and typically, the close union which Christ, the Only-begotten, who was in the bosom of the Father from eternity, forms between God and men through the regeneration of the Holy Ghost.—P. S.]

And the glory. The δόξα, כְּבוֹד יְהוָֹה. This is that revealed form of Jehovah underlying the call to adoption throughout the Old Testament, which often stands out more definitely in the appearance of the Angel of the Lord (see Lange's *Comm. Genesis*) [p. 385 ff., Amer. ed.]. Comp. Exod. xxiv. 16; xl. 34; 1 Kings viii. 10 f.; Ezek. i. 28, and other passages). Untenable explanations: 1. The ark of the covenant (Beza, Grotius, and others, with reference to 1 Sam. iv. 22). 2. The glory of Israel itself (Calovius, Köllner, Fritzsche, Beck, and oth-

* In the discussions on this subject, a second meaning of ἀπό has not been taken into consideration: ἀπὸ πατρός, on the paternal side, &c.

ses). For the still more untenable explanations of Michaelis and Koppe, see Meyer (the adoption itself as glory, the promised *felicitas*). Meyer's own explanation is totally unsatisfactory: "The symbolical and visible presence of God as manifested in the desert as a pillar of cloud and of fire, and as the cloud over the ark of the covenant, the same שְׁכִינָה" (Buxtorf, *Lexic.*, Talmud, &c.). For more particular information on Meyer's indefinite view, see Tholuck.—De Wette and Philippi do not really get beyond "the visible and operative presence of God," or, the "symbol of God's gracious presence." [As Paul is enumerating the prerogatives of the Jews, a definite meaning is to be sought for. Meyer's view attaches a definite meaning to δόξα, extending it, however, over a wide period of time. Dr. Lange's objection to this grows out of his classification of these prerogatives in chronological order. If this δόξα must be referred to patriarchal times, then Lange's view alone is admissible; but the word is used by one who is glancing over the whole Jewish history, and in that history "the visible presence of God" seems most worthy of the title δόξα.—R.]

And the covenants. *Αἱ διαθῆκαι. The compacts.* The δόξα already announced itself at the call of Abraham. [If Meyer's view of δόξα be adopted, then the reference to the call of Abraham in υἱοθεσία is the point of connection here.—R.] The covenant with Abraham was renewed with Isaac (and this is of importance here, in contrast with Ishmael), with Jacob (in contrast with Esau), and, finally, with the whole people through Moses. Various explanations: 1. The two tables of the law (Beza, and others). 2. The Old and the New Testaments [see *Textual Note* [2].—R.] (Augustine, Jerome, Cocceius, Calovius; with reference to Jer. xxxi. 33). Meyer: "The compacts concluded by God with the patriarchs after Abraham." Comp. Book of Wisdom xviii. 22; Sirach xliv. 11; 2 Macc. viii. 15; Eph. ii. 12. [This is undoubtedly the simplest view.—R.]

And the giving of the law. Opposite explanations: 1. Meyer, and others: the act of giving the law, not ὁ νόμος itself. 2. Tholuck [Hodge], and most expositors: νομοθεσία, by metonyme for ὁ νόμος; νομοθεσία is the more rhetorical and euphonious word. Evidently, the act of giving the law would have had no permanent force for Israel apart from its substance; but even its substance would be no permanent νομοθεσία without the continued repetition (Deuteronomy), establishment, and restoration of the law. The νόμος was, and continued to be, a permanent act of the νομοθεσία. [Meyer inquires why Paul did not write νόμος, if he meant it. "At all events, whoever had the νομοθεσία, had also the νόμος. Still, the difference of signification is to be preserved. The *giving of the law* was a work by means of which God, who was himself the νομοθέτης, distinguished the Jews above all other nations." It seems safer to make the primary reference to the giving of the law, without, however, excluding the necessary secondary reference to its substance.—R.]

And the service of the sanctuary. The worship, ἡ λατρεία; Heb. ix. 1. [The Jewish ritual service, including the tabernacle worship, but fully established in the temple. The connection of this with the giving of the law is sufficiently obvious.—**And the promises,** αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι.—R.] Meyer holds that the service corresponds to the giving of the law, as αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι (the Messianic prophecies) correspond to αἱ διαθῆκαι. This is a chiasm, according to Meyer, occasioned by the necessity of the *promises* standing at the conclusion, immediately before the *Promised One.* But a chiasm is altogether out of the question, as the promises in the stricter sense—the prophetic promises—followed the giving of the law, and as the λατρεία also was already, in the main, a *typical* promise, from which the ἐπαγγελίαι are only to be distinguished as verbal prophecies. Tholuck concludes, without good ground, from the reasoning (ver. 6), that the predictions of the prophets are not meant here, but "chiefly" those communicated to the patriarchs. But how could Paul have *enumerated* the principal elements of Israel's glory, without thinking of the prophets? We must adhere to the position that, apart from the connections of historical sequence, the υἱοθεσία, the δόξα, &c., and, indeed, all the particular elements, pervaded all the periods of Israel's existence. Even the νομοθεσία, for example, is found in the germ in Abraham.

Ver. 5. **Whose are the fathers** [ὧν οἱ πατέρες]. The fathers, the elect, the men of God, as preludes to the chief Chosen One, the Son of God; the glorious root of the Israelitish parent-tree, as well as the fatness of the tree (see chap. xi. 17), referring to the only glorious crown (Exod. iii. 13; iv. 5). These are chiefly, but not exclusively, the patriarchs, but, in addition to them, the long line of the true fathers of Israel.

And of whom as to the flesh is Christ [καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα]. It is the highest characteristic of Israel's glory, that Christ descends from it, or comes of it according to the flesh (Rom. i. 3; iv. 1 ff.). [Christ, the promised Messiah, is the greatest of all the blessings imparted to the people of Israel, to whom all the others pointed typically and prophetically, and in whom they first obtained their full truth and reality. —P. S.] The τὸ κατά σάρκα is evidently a qualifying addition, and refers to an antithesis; Tholuck: "οὐ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα" (chap. i. 3, 4). [Alford marks the antithesis by rendering: "*as far as regards the flesh;*" finding in τό, accusative, the implication "that He was not *entirely* sprung from them, but had another nature."—R.]

Who is over all [Ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων. There are two renderings which are nearly allied: *Who is God over all, blessed forever*, and: *Who is over all, God blessed forever.* The doctrinal results are the same, whichever be adopted; but Lange prefers the latter, for reasons which will appear, and seems warranted in his preference. The E. V. gives the latter; Luther, and most interpreters, the former.—R.] We explain the passage thus: He who is over all Israelites, believers and unbelievers, is that glorified One of our universally known synagogical formula: God, blessed forever. Amen. We must first of all accept a strong Pauline breviloquence. Then we must call to mind Paul's expression concerning the unknown God (Acts xvii. 23). As Paul could say to the Greeks: "You seek and worship by your altar the one true God, without knowing Him," so can he say of the Jews: "Even those who reject Christ must render homage to Him, though unconsciously, as, by the well-known doxology, they often praise Jehovah, the God of revelation, who has appeared in Christ, and thus rules supremely over all, believers as well as unbelievers." The ὁ ὢν therefore stands for ὅς ἐστι,

though with the additional strength peculiar to the participle. That the ἐπὶ πάντων here refers to the Jews, according to their antithesis of believing and unbelieving Jews, is evident from the strong prominence previously given to them (οἵτινες, ὧν, ἐξ ὧν). [The form of the E. V. favors this view of ἐπὶ πάντων. By taking it as masculine, the whole clause is brought into closer connection with the context, an increased difficulty in the interpretation of the doxology is obviated, while this closer connection gives strength to the view that the doxology refers to Christ. It seems preferable to the view which connects it with θεός, in the sense of *the supreme God* (Hodge, and many others). Whether all that Lange suggests is included, is perhaps doubtful; but comp. his remarks below on Ps. lxviii. 19.—R.]

God blessed for ever. Amen [Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν]. We must regard this clause as a quotation from the synagogical liturgy, sufficiently well-known to all the Jews, and to Jewish Christians and believers in general. According to modern usage, it should, therefore, be written with quotation-marks. But the sense is this: Christ is the object of the Israelitish doxology to the revealed God, Jehovah, for He is the δόξα itself; is consciously praised by some, and unconsciously by the rest; for this latter class, notwithstanding their rejection of Jesus of Nazareth, cannot get away from the adoration of the Shekinah, and thus Christ also, the personally revealed God, rules over all (as they praise Him), even over unbelievers, for their future salvation. This is therefore the last advantage of Israel (see chap. xi.). For the details of all the explanations, we must refer to the Commentaries extant.*

Every exposition is attended with great difficulties. The strongest reasons are still in favor of the old one, transmitted to us by the early writers, all of whom favored it, with the single exception of Theodore of Mopsvestia (see Tholuck, p. 479). We may say, perhaps, that Julian maintained, with Cyril, that Paul never called Jesus "God," and that the Codd. 11 [5], 47 place a period after σάρκα, and Cod. 71 places one after ἐπὶ πάντων. Here belong also Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, &c., and the most of the later expositors (see Meyer). The passage is, therefore, a doxology to the divinity of Christ. This is most strongly favored by the requirement of the antithesis comprised in the τὸ κατὰ σάρκα (see chap i. 3, 4; 1 Tim. iii. 16). This explanation has been rendered unnecessarily difficult by regarding ἐπὶ πάντων as neuter: "over every thing" (Beza referred it as masculine to the patriarchs, to the antithesis of Jews and Gentiles), thus giving up its proximate reference to the Jews.

Since the time of Erasmus, this exposition has been directly opposed by another, the reference of the clause to God. "The Codd. 11 [5], 47, of the 11th and 12th centuries, like Diodorus of Tarsus, place a period after σαρκα; this punctuation has been preferred by Erasmus, so that what follows is a doxology to the Almighty God. This proposition has found favor with the majority of recent exegetical writers, with the Socinians, &c., with Reiche, Rückert, Meyer, and Fritzsche." Tholuck. A middle ground is occupied by the interpretation which unites with a second punctuation proposed by Erasmus, according to Cod. 71, as it places a period after ἐπὶ πάντων; this has been adopted by Locke and Baumgarten-Crusius, a construction to which Tholuck also inclines to a certain degree. In addition to these three explanations are, the conjecture of Erasmus, that θεός is not authentic, and the reading ὧν ὁ θεός proposed by Crell, and others. But, according to Tholuck, the detached character of the doxology is against the third exposition.

The following may be said against the second explanation:

1. In simple doxologies, without a relative form, the εὐλογητός generally precedes the θεός. See examples in Tholuck, 483; Philippi, 369 ff. Tholuck regards it as a beautiful fact connected with Faustus Socinus, that his attention was first directed to this circumstance, and that, owing to it, he changed his exposition of the passage. Tholuck, indeed, cites a passage in which the εὐλογητός comes after the θεός (Ps. lxviii. 10)—a passage which, in view of its connection, we regard as very important, and must hereafter return to it.

2. A doxology to the omnipotent God cannot interrupt the train of thought under consideration at its very outset; least of all, can an elegy or funeral discourse be changed abruptly into a hymn. The doxology for the whole discussion in Rom. ix.–xi., is at the conclusion of chap. xi.

3. The expression, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, which limits Christ's descent from the Jews to His human nature, requires, as an antithesis, a reference to His divine nature. We have here had special reference to Calvin, Tholuck, Neander, and Philippi. In the attack on the old exposition, it is remarkable that the same critical exegesis which elsewhere urges the immediate context, and leaves the analogy of Scripture altogether in the background, here reverses its method. Meyer, indeed, only says, that both expositions might be equally right, according to the words. But he imagines that he can overcome the requirement of the antithesis in this passage merely by the assurance that divinity does not necessarily belong to the object represented. The doxologies to God which Meyer cites (Rom. i. 25; 2 Cor. xi. 31; Gal. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 17), are fully occasioned by the connection, which would not hold good of the present doxology. Meyer contradicts himself when he first urges that the present passage does not read ὁ θεός, but only the predicative θεός, without the article; and when he concedes that Paul, by virtue of his appropriate and real harmony with John's christology, could, just as properly as John (chap. i. 1), have used the predicative θεός (divine nature) of Christ (with reference to Phil. ii. 6; Col. i. 15 ff.; ii. 9; 2 Cor. iv. 4), and yet urges that Paul never used the expression θεός of Christ, since he never accepted the Alexandrian form, like John, but adhered to the strictly monotheistical form. He seems, therefore, to regard that "Alexandrian form" as prejudicial to strict monotheism. [It should be remarked that Meyer, who is usually so clear and

* [Comp. a learned essay by Hermann Schultz (Professor in Basle): *Rom. ix. 5, in exegetischer und biblisch-theologischer Beziehung, erklärt*, in the *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* for 1868, pp. 462–506, and the older exegetical literature on this passage, there cited against the interpretation of the Socinians and Semler. Schultz refers the doxology to Christ, yet not to the preëxistent, but the theanthropic, glorified Christ, to what He now is. This is the highest glory of Israel, that He who is exalted above all things was born of it. This essay is exhaustive and convincing in its defence of the received punctuation. It closes, however, with some speculations, which imply a discrepancy between the simple Gospel narratives and the more profound christological positions of the Epistles (and the Gospel of John).—R.]

decided in his statements of the reasons for his views, halts here, as if the grounds against the reference to Christ were not sufficient to satisfy himself. This fact is suggestive.—R.] As far as those passages are concerned in which Paul brings out the divinity of Christ, we refer to the *Doctr. Notes.* We must here, however, oppose the hermeneutical supposition that there are no doctrinal ἅπαξ λεγόμενα as culminating points of the view corresponding with them. Meyer even holds that John calls Christ θεός but once. It is a perfectly gratuitous increase of the difficulty before us, to say that Christ is here called *God over all.* It is certainly a fact that Paul speaks preëminently of the *historical* Christ, and that, when he expresses also the *ontological* idea of Christ, he immediately places it in relation with the historical perfection of Christ; but when this *historical* subordination which Paul expresses (1 Cor. viii. 6; Eph. iv. 5 f.; 1 Cor. xv. 28) is allowed to be identical with His *ontological* subordination, the error is owing to a defective ecclesiastical education and speculative penetration.

We now come to Ps. lxviii. 19, according to the Septuagint: Κύριος ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητός, εὐλογητὸς κύριος ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν. It must be borne in mind that Paul was particularly familiar with that passage. In Eph. iv. 8 he quotes a good part of ver. 18, and refers it to Christ. But this verse reads, according to De Wette's translation, thus: Thou ascendest to the high seat, thou leadest captive, thou receivest gifts for men, *and the rebellious shall also dwell with Jah.* Tholuck: *Even the apostates shall still dwell with God the Lord.* Do we not plainly hear the reëcho of this passage in the ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων? And since we know that Paul applies this passage to the glorification of Christ, is it not clear that he immediately adds that ascription of praise in Ps. lxviii. 19? His expression occupies the middle ground between the LXX. and the Hebrew text. Hence we return to the acceptance of a synagogical form.

[The main point being not the synagogical form—to which, however, there is little to object—but the reference to Christ, the following summary in favor of that view is added:

(1.) This view is the most simple and natural one. Alford seems justifiable in remarking: *It is the only one admissible by the rules of grammar and arrangement.*

(2.) It accords best with the context, presenting an antithesis to τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, and forming a suitable culminating point after the enumeration of the advantages of the Jews.

(3.) It is sufficiently Pauline, for Paul wrote Col. i. 15 ff., and in view of that and many similar passages, any other reference would be derogatory to the divinity of Christ.

(4.) On no exegetical point, where there is room for discussion, has the unanimity of commentators, of all ages and confessions, been so entire, as in referring this to Christ.—R.]

B. *The Apostle's exultation at the thought that the promise of God for Israel nevertheless remains in force* (vers. 6–33).

FIRST PROOF: *Differences in election* (vers. 6–13). Meyer: "The first part of the theodicy is, that God's promise has not become untrue through the exclusion of a portion of the Israelites; for the promise is valid only for the true Israelites, who are according to the promise—which result is confirmed by the Scriptures."

Ver. 6. **It is not however so that.** The οὐχ οἷον δὲ ὅτι is variously rendered: 1. Analogously to the οὐχ ὅτι, *not that, not in the sense that* (Tholuck). But this does not afford a satisfactory connection with the foregoing. 2. Fritzsche: οὐ τοιοῦτον ὅτι [*the matter, however, is not so, as that*]. 3. Οὐ τοῖον δὲ λέγω οἷον ὅτι, "but I do not say any thing of such a kind as that" (Meyer). 4. The least tenable explanation is, *it is not possible that* (Beza, Grotius). [Between (2.) and (3.) there is little choice. Paul does not *say any thing of such a kind as that,* because *the matter is not so as that;* or *vice versâ.*—R.] The connection, therefore, consists in the Apostle's declaration of a restriction of the profound sorrow which he has already expressed; but not, according to Origen, in connecting the declaration that the promise still holds good, to the previously mentioned ἐπαγγελίαι. Tholuck: "Paul adduces the proof according to the idea with which he was quite familiar, that the real Israel was not based upon its physical relationship with Abraham (Gal. iii. 9; Rom. iv. 12). This brings out in glaring contrast the shibboleth of the carnal Jew, &c.; gross heretics, deniers of the resurrection of the dead, &c., are only mentioned as exceptions."

The word of God hath come to nought [ἐκπέπτωκεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ]. The word of patriarchal promise in its relation to Israel, not specially to the ἐπαγγελίαι alone.

For not all who are of Israel, are Israel [οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ, οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ]. The germ of the distinction between the true religious Israel and the impure and merely national Israelites, already lay in the Old Testament (see chap. x.; Ps. cxii. 1; Ezek. xiii. 9; Jer. vii. 28, &c.); the distinction was already prepared by the relations of election in the history of the patriarchs. The Apostle's thought distinguishes, first of all, between Israel as the collective people of God, and the single apostate branches. But then he establishes this general distinction chiefly by the relations of election.

Ver. 7. **Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children** [οὐδ' ὅτι εἰσὶν σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, πάντες τέκνα]. The σπέρμα Ἀβρ. denotes here natural posterity, but the τέκνα, on the contrary, his spiritual posterity, and directly from Israel. It may be asked here, whether the subject of the preceding verse (*which are of Israel*) still continues (Meyer), or whether the present clause generalizes the subject: not all those who are Abraham's seed are therefore also Abraham's children. We prefer the latter construction, because, otherwise, the verse cited would furnish no proof. The first clause—for they are not all Israel which are of Israel, God's people—is therefore supplemented by the second—likewise not all who are descended from Abraham, and thus, directly from Ishmael and Isaac, are true children of Abraham; that is, not merely individual believers, as in chap. iv., but rather the individuals chosen, elected beforehand through God's free choice.

This is now followed by particular proofs, which show that God's election, notwithstanding the promise given to Abraham, remained totally free, contrary to the boast of a right of natural descent.

First proof: Abraham's first born son was not Abraham's child of promise, but, according to God's disposition, the younger, with his seed. And that, indeed, was previously established by God. Refer

ence could also be made here to the preference of Sarah to Hagar; and, therefore, the *second* and more convincing proof follows: Rebecca. It is important that Rebecca, and not Isaac, appears in the foreground, but then, also, that she conceived twins by Isaac in *one* pregnancy; and *third*, that a determination is made respecting children as yet unborn, which gave the preference to Jacob.

But (thus the promise reads) **in Isaac** [ἀλλ' Ἐν Ἰσαάκ. Gen. xxi. 12. See *Textual Note* [7] for the Hebrew.] Though the decisive promise is quoted directly and authentically, without a γέγραπται, or any thing of similar import, as in Gal. iii. 11, 12, it is nevertheless a simple logical requirement to supply something of the kind mentally; this, however, is contested by Meyer. The promise is quoted from the Septuagint. Meyer maintains, in accordance with Gesenius, that the original text בְּיִצְחָק would say: *Through Isaac* will the posterity be called; but that the Apostle has conceived the sense of the passage according to its typical meaning, and confined it to *Isaac's* person. [So Philippi, Ewald.] The entire digression on this supposed antithesis rests upon a mistake of the significance of the typical collective name. The name of Isaac here can just as little exclude his posterity, as the included posterity can exclude Isaac himself. Meyer says: all Jews belonged to the offspring of Isaac, and therefore the expression would be inappropriate, if those whose claims are to be disappointed, are also described by it. But yet, in vers. 11 and 12, the election of Jacob is evidently meant at the same time with that of his posterity, but without the Apostle having designed thus to favor again the claim of individual Jews. The examples cited serve to prove that the distinguishing process of election, in reference to the descendants of Jacob also, was not hindered by the election of their ancestor with his σπέρμα, but rather that it took place with perfect freedom in reference to the posterity.

Shall thy seed be called [κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα]. Different explanations of the κληθήσεται (*erit, shall be; shall be awakened;* shall be called from nothing); [Tholuck, Stuart; Reiche. Meyer objects to this, on the ground, that this promise was made *after* Isaac was born. As we are less warranted in referring the citation exclusively to Isaac's descendants, than to Isaac alone, this objection seems to be valid and conclusive.—R.] The καλεῖν brings out the freedom of Divine choice; not in the sense that he merely became the ancestor of the promised seed, but in and with Isaac the seed of promise belonging to Abraham was called, according to the election. [Hodge, Alford, and most.] Freedom of election is thus distinguished by two characteristics: *only in Isaac*, and, *only by virtue of free appointment.*

Ver. 8. **That is, They who are the children of the flesh** [Τοῦτ' ἔστιν, οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκός. Comp. Gal. iv. 23]. The children who are to be regarded merely as the fruit of physical generation. The antithesis, **the children of the promise** [τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας], makes these appear as born under the predetermination and coöperation of the Divine promise. The expression, "*promised* children," would be too little; while the expression, "begotten by the power of the Divine promise" (Meyer), would be too strong. [The facts respecting the birth of Isaac, and Paul's language in Galatians, seem to justify Meyer's view; the conception of Isaac was so extraordinary, and so connected with the promise, that he is called "after the Spirit," in distinction from one "born after the flesh," as well as "by promise;" still in neither case is Isaac said to be *born by promise* or *after the Spirit*, as if to guard after any thought of miraculous conception. Lange himself says below, that "the promise acted as a producing and coöperative cause."—R.]

Not those children of the flesh are **children of God** [ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ], but the children designated by the promise **are reckoned as seed** [λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα]. The antithesis must be carefully observed. Even the children of promise are not, in themselves, children of God in the New Testament sense. They are counted such according to their faith, and therefore typically so called in the sense that they are the seed of God's children as the seed of promise. Also in this line there are not yet children born of God (see John i. 13).*

Ver. 9. **For this word was of promise** [ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος. Notice the emphatic position of ἐπαγγελίας. "The children of *promise* are reckoned for seed; for this word, in fulfilment of which Isaac was born, was a word of *promise*" (Alford).—R.] Free quotation from Gen. xviii. 10, 14, according to the Septuagint.

At this season [Κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον; *i. e.*, next year at this time. See *Textual Note* [8].—R.] The accessory proof in this verse will show, first, that Isaac was now already an object of promise; second, that the promise ("according to the time") acted as a producing and coöperative cause; and third, that the bestowal of the right of childhood was attributed for Abraham's faith.†

Ver. 10. **And not only this; but when Rebecca also** [οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ῥεβέκκα]. Winer's supplementing explanation, οὐ μόνον δὲ Σάῤῥα ἐπαγγελμένη ἦν (Meyer: Not only Sarah, but Rebecca also, had a Divine promise), is repelled by Tholuck, with the reminder that it was not Sarah, but Abraham, who had received that ἐπαγγελία. Tholuck, with Erasmus and Rückert, prefers to supply a τοῦτο to μόνον δέ, and δείκνυσι τοῦτο, or something similar, to Rebecca. Grotius, and others, in acordance with the sense, interpret similarly: *non solum id, quod jam diximus, documentum est ejus, quod inferre volumus.* [The view of Tholuck seems least objectionable. Ῥεβέκκα is then either the nominative absolute, or we must accept an anacoluthon. The sense is the same in either case. Philippi prefers the former decidedly, on grammatical grounds, and takes this as almost = *behold, Rebecca too.* The progress of thought is against Meyer's view.—R.]

* [Stuart, and others, deny the highest spiritual sense to the phrase "children of God," limiting it to "children of promise in respect to the external privileges and blessings of the ancient covenant or dispensation." In itself there would be no objection to this view, but Paul had already written Gal. iv. 22-31, where these phrases receive a deeper meaning (see Lange's *Comm. Gal.*, pp. 113 ff., 120 ff.). Besides, if this were all, it would not differ from the idea already suggested in vers. 6, 7 (Hodge). We must hold then to a typical sense at least, and find, in "reckoned," the guard against the assumption of spiritual privilege from natural descent.—R.]

† [Stuart suggests the interpretation: "*as at life-giving time;*" in which case the meaning would be, that God would again address her as a mother, who gives life to—*i. e.*, bears, children." But there seems to be no reason for departing from the simple rendering of the LXX. quoted by Paul.—R.]

In consequence of the ambiguity of the brief form of expression, we must consult the contents themselves. But, according to these, Rebecca is not merely a second example, but even a new one for the same fundamental thoughts. She is a new example, in whom there appear three new characteristics. *First*, Rebecca appears in the foreground as a principal person, and becomes the parallel to Abraham. The Apostle says to the Jews, as carefully as he can, that the weight of the promise does not rest upon Isaac, the promised natural seed of Abraham, but on the daughter-in-law, Bethuel's daughter, who had become Isaac's wife. Then comes the principal characteristic which constitutes the real antithesis:

[**Had conceived by one, our father Isaac,** ἐξ ἑνὸς κοίτην ἔχουσα, Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.—R.] Between the twin children of one marriage, by one husband, and from one conception or pregnancy (*bed*, κοίτη, see chap. xiii. 12; not emphasized as unity, but really so understood), the election already made the greatest difference before birth. This leads to the third characteristic:

Ver. 11. [**Without their having as yet been born, or done any thing good or evil,** μήπω γὰρ γεννηθέντων μηδὲ πραξάντων τὶ ἀγαθὸν ἢ φαῦλον. See *Textual Notes* [10] and [11].—R.] Before the children had done any thing either good or bad.* This example denies once more, as though superfluously, the exclusive privilege of birthright. In view of all this, we think that the real explanation of the οὐ μόνον δέ is contained in the second characteristic—not merely that Sarah, the unfruitful one, is a proof, but also Rebecca, in her pregnancy with twins. It is Sarah, in so far as the promise determines a year beforehand that the unfruitful Sarah, instead of the mother of Ishmael, should be the mother of the promised one; and Rebecca, in so far as the promise made even the greatest difference between the twin-fruit of her womb.

The expression, τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, indicates that also the paternity of Isaac did not guarantee any choice concerning the Jews. The μήπω † expresses the fact that God's revelation concerning the preference of the younger before the birth of the twins (αὐτῶν must be supplied) was intentional, in order

That the purpose of God according to election might stand [ἵνα ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ μένῃ.] Meyer holds, that the ἵνα therefore determines, at all events, a purpose. But he incorrectly denies that the ἐκλογή here precedes the πρόθεσις. [Meyer opposes this precedence, on the ground that the *election* is essentially pre-temporal (Eph. iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9), objecting also to the view of Grotius, and others, that the phrase means: a decree considered with respect to an election. He holds that, as an essential inherent of the purpose, κατ' ἐκλογήν expresses the modality of πρόθεσις. Perhaps it is not safe to affirm positively more than this respecting what belongs to the order in the mind of God. Meyer also repels the strong view of Bengel: *propositum Dei electivum;* but after all has been admitted, that must be respecting the primary reference to theocratic privilege (Meyer limits thus), the Apostle's language fairly implies a choice of individuals, and a free choice, whether we can reconcile this with our systems, or our consciousness of our own freedom or not. The emphasis throughout, it may well be admitted, rests on the unmerited choice of Jacob, rather than on the rejection of Esau.—R.] The ἐκλογή is founded in the εὐδοκία, and the πρόθεσις joins with the latter. Meyer's opposition to the explanation of the expression (of Rosenmüller, and others) *propositum Dei liberum*, is correct only so far as the *election of love* and *arbitrary freedom* are different; but the election of love is certainly free in relation to human claims. The following clause expresses a principal maxim of the πρόθεσις.

Not of works, but of him that calleth [οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος]. The explanation of most commentators, that the πρόθεσις is announced by this negation, is contrary to Meyer's assertion, that this addition relates only to μένῃ: *and indeed he has this, his strong assurance, not from works*, &c., *but of him that calleth.*—Works cannot be the foundation of the call to salvation, but just the reverse; it is only this call that can be the foundation of works. [This phrase seems to be "a general characteristic of the whole transaction" (Alford). Such a view is favored by the peculiarly broken construction of the whole verse. In any case, it establishes the position of Augustine: "God does not choose us *because* we believe, but *that* we may believe." "Hence, too, we are justified not *on account* of faith (*propter fidem*), but *through* faith (*per fidem*), which God himself works in us through the Holy Ghost (Schaff). Any other view would contradict the obvious meaning of this verse. Comp. Hodge and Philippi on each side of the predestinarian question as involved here.—R.]

Ver. 12. **The elder** (that is, the first-born) **shall serve the younger** [ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι] (Gen. xxv. 23, according to the Septuagint).—Here, again, Meyer finds a difference between the original sense of the passage and the Apostle's explanation. According to the connection of the original, the expression extends to the nations concerned (Jews and Edomites), and was fulfilled in David's conquest of the Edomites (2 Sam. viii. 14, &c.);* but Paul means, on the contrary, Esau and Jacob themselves. The adjustment of the difference by regarding the two brothers as representatives of two nations, is insufficient; rather, the *indoles* of Jacob was really continued in the Jewish people, and the *indoles* of Esau in the Edomites. [The reference of the original Hebrew, as shown by the context, is to the nations springing from the twin children ("two nations are in thy womb;" Gen. xxv. 23). Lange and Meyer agree that there is also a personal reference, though differing in their mode of stating the relation of the two

* [It must be noticed that this expression contains an incidental argument against the Platonic and Origenistic doctrine of the preëxistence of souls, and their exile into this world in consequence of a previous fall. This theory, revived again and again, is as unsatisfactory as it is unscriptural, but must be considered one of the many attempts to solve the enigma which this chapter confronts. Clearly, then, Paul rejects this solution.—R.]

† [Meyer: "Not οὔπω, because the negative relation is to be expressed *subjectively*—*i. e.*, as presented and considered by God in the giving of His sentence." See Winer, p. 441.—R.]

* [Subsequent conquests of the Edomites are mentioned; 2 Kings viii. 21; xiv. 7, 22; 2 Chron. xxv 11; xxvi. 2. They were finally conquered by John Hyrcanus and incorporated into the Jewish nation.—R.]

Neither should be excluded, though the whole passage seems to indicate that the personal reference was the more prominent one in Paul's mind. On the national reference, Schaff remarks: "At all events, in the passages quoted here and ver. 13, Jacob and Esau appear as the heads of two nations. If the promised lordship of Jacob be not limited to the transfer of the birthright and the theocratic blessing to Jacob, but taken in its full, physical, and spiritual sense, the fulfilment did not take place until long after their death, in their descendants, when David conquered the Edomites (2 Sam. viii. 14). Since then the Ishmaelites and the Edomites, together with the other heathen, were at all events called to the gospel, though later than the Jews (comp. Gen. xxvii. 40, where Isaac predicts the future cessation of the bondage of Esau; and Amos ix. 12; Acts xv. 16, 17; Rom. xi. 11 ff.); it follows that Paul speaks here, not as many Calvinistic expositors misunderstand him, of an *eternal* reprobation, but of such a preference of one nation as shall prepare for the final salvation of all nations (we do not say, all individuals)." The individual reference is also undeniable, though it by no means follows that it here implies *eternal results*. The point here is not *what* or *how much* God did in His election, but that He had a *πρόθεσις κατ' ἐκλογήν*.—R.]

Ver. 13. **As it is written, Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated** [*Τὸν Ἰακὼβ ἠγάπησα, τὸν δὲ Ἡσαῦ ἐμίσησα*]. Mal. i. 2 ff.: "I have loved you, saith the Lord. Yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the Lord: yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness." Here the statement that Jehovah *hated* Esau is proved by the fact that He gave a desolate land to the Edomites for an inheritance, and that He called it a wicked land, on which His indignation rested. Thus the people are placed first here, but with them also their ancestor, as in Gen. xxv. 23 the ancestor is placed first, but with him his people also.

The following is therefore assumed throughout: 1. The continuity of the *indoles* in the ancestor and in the real substance of his posterity; 2. The *universal* connection between the *indoles* and its religious and moral conduct; 3. The universal connection between the religious and moral conduct and the historical decrees. The sum of these characteristics is now referred to the Divine *purpose*, and is applied to Esau in the sentence, "I hated him." Yet this sentence has, at most, only a relative meaning: God has hated Esau in the relation of Esau to Jacob, and in antithesis to the fact that He loved Jacob. God's whole arrangement, therefore, proceeds from the primary *πρόθεσις* that He loved Jacob. In that fact lies the causality of Jacob's glorious history, the determination of his theocratic inheritance. But the whole sentence depends upon various conditions on both sides:

1. An *economical* condition. The question is not at all concerning decrees of eternal salvation and damnation, but concerning the *economical* relations of the ordination and *call* to the possession of salvation and to the economy of salvation in time. On the prospects of salvation for Edom, comp. Isa. xi. 14 (Dan. xi. 41); Amos ix. 12; Mark iii. 8. On the other hand, Edom has become, on its dark side, a type of anti-christianity. See the article *Edomiter*, in the *Bibl. Wörterbuch für das christliche Volk*. Likewise the passage in Heb. xii. 17 relates to Esau's incapacity to inherit the theocratic blessing even with tears and penitence.

2. An *individual* condition. There could be also in Edom individuals having the character of Israel, and in Israel there could be individual Edomites. The LXX. has regarded Job as an Edomite prince. Allowing this to be uncertain, the Edomite nature of the Israelitish Judas is beyond a doubt.

3. A *religious-ethical* condition. Salvation was as little secured unconditionally to the individual Jew by Israel's election, as the individual Edomite was personally subjected to condemnation by that theocratic rejection of Edom (see Bengel). Meyer: "We must not attach such a merely privative meaning to the *ἐμίσησα** as *not to love*, or *to love less* (Grotius, Estius [Hodge, Stuart], and others), which is also not confirmed by Matt. vi. 24; Luke xiv. 26; xvi. 13; John xii. 25; but it expresses just the opposite of the positive *ἠγάπ*.—positive abhorrence." This would be still more than hatred! Meyer also speaks of a *becoming fond of* and *abhorrence* even before the birth of the brothers. Yet here the meaning might be: I have loved the letter, but the spirit of the letter I have loved less! † This, indeed, might be said of many of the results of modern criticism and exegesis. Philippi lessens at least the antithesis in relation to Jacob and Esau themselves, but yet without thereby becoming rid of the traditional prejudices respecting the sense of this passage. "Jacob's reception of the theocratic birthright, and Esau's exclusion from it, constitute, in Paul's mind, only the type for *the law of the reception of eternal salvation and of abandonment to eternal perdition*." But the law of this reception and abandonment is not given here, but in Mark xvi. 16. The following interpretation is better, if we understand thereby not absolute, but relative antitheses. Calvin well explains *ἀγαπᾶν* and *μισεῖν* by *assumere* and *repellere*. The use of *μισεῖν* is similar (Gen. xxix. 30, 31; Deut. xxi. 15 ff.; Prov. xiii. 24; Matt. vi. 24; Luke xvi. 13; Matt. x. 37; comp. with Luke xiv. 26; John xii. 25). "To hate father and mother, and his own soul, does not mean to love them less than the Lord, but to reject them altogether in a case of collision, or to so act toward them as if one positively hated them (?); in which case there might still exist a great deal of love for them, though certainly less than for the Lord."—If, indeed, *absolute love* and a *conditional love* = *loving less*, are at variance with each other, then the disregard, which is similar to hatred, though not partaking of the nature of hatred, follows of itself; it is

* [It cannot be denied that *hate*, in the Scripture, does not always describe positive abhorrence, but occasionally a less degree, or, more accurately, the absence of love; *e. g.*, Gen. xxix. 31 (where the original text says: "Leah was *hated*" by Jacob—*i. e.*, less loved than Rachel; comp. ver. 30); Matt. vi. 24, and especially Luke xiv. 24; compared with Matt. x. 37, where one evangelist says *hateth not*, and the other, *loveth more*. The word undoubtedly, even in these passages, taken exactly, describes not merely an absence of love, but a formal putting into the background. —P. S.]

† [This is an allusion to the strictly literal and grammatical method of exegesis adopted by Meyer. But if we depart from the letter, who is to be the discerner of the spirit? There are but two answers: that of Rome (ecclesiastical authority), and that of Rationalism (individual human consciousness). The strict interpretation of Meyer is adopted by Fritzsche, De Wette, and others. Unquestionably the dealings of God with Esau indicate something positive, though, were it but the deprivation of love, the results of evil-doing would still account for the historical facts.—R.]

the negation of the defect or of the sin to which the hated individual *cleaves*, but it is not the individual to which the defect or the sin cleaves. See also Tholuck, p. 498, against Fritzshe, Meyer, De Wette, and Philippi.

It must be observed, further, that, in ver. 18, the description of *fore-ordination* or *predestination* according to election, is introduced by ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις. The idea of election refutes the following claims to a right in God's kingdom:

1. The claim by virtue of natural descent from Abraham, the father of the faithful, especially by virtue of birthright; 2. The claim by virtue of descent from the legitimate marriage concluded under the promise; 3. The claim by virtue of the merit of works.

Election takes place freely:

1. Without regard to the advantage of birthright; 2. to descent from a family that is blessed; 3. to community even in a twin-birth; 4. and to the foreseeing of works. And all this is on the simple ground that election, *a.* voluntarily determines the *indoles* beforehand, thereby avoiding all appearance of natural necessity, the requirement of birthright, &c.; *b.* and, accordng to the *indoles* or economical endowment, it also makes a πρόθεσις in regard to the economical call. [The sum of the whole matter, detaching from it all reference to the extent of the preference or the result of the choice of God in this instance, is, that God does exercise a prerogative of choice or election, independently of all these human considerations. That this is the point to which Paul would bring his readers, is evident from what immediately follows. A further proof that a general truth is also to be drawn from it, is afforded by the constant use made of special points in Old Testament history and of Old Testament passages to establish general propositions (see the case of Pharaoh, below, ver. 17, which, as far as the individual in question is concerned, has no connection with the discussion, and New Testament *passim*). This method of citation is based on the stability of the Divine character; to deny its propriety, is to presume an arbitrariness on the part of God, in far greater opposition to His character than is implied even in most fearfully fatalistic view of this chapter.—R.]

SECOND PROOF: *The antithesis in fore-ordination (predestination). God is not unrighteous in showing mercy and in hardening, and in His manner of uniting judgment and compassion* (vers. 14–18).* Meyer: The second part of the theodicy.

Ver. 14. **What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God?** [Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; μὴ ἀδικία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ; Comp. chap. iii. 5.] The Jew cannot refute the facts that Ishmael was rejected in spite of his birthright, and that Esau was rejected in spite of his legitimacy and birthright. Just here was a special point of pride with the Jew. But the consistency of this fact had now appeared — the absolute freedom of Divine choice. Israel's call was itself the strongest witness against the claims of the Israelites, because by it the most weighty prejudices concerning their privileges were overcome. But, finally, God's promise to Rebecca stood firm, and by this was decided, that the works of the Israelites could no more impose conditions on God's free exercise of His authority, than could be done formerly by the works of Jacob, when God assigned to him beforehand the domination over his brother—that is, the theocratic honor. It was especially this declaration against the claims established on works which was calculated to excite the Judaizing spirit, and lead it to the conclusion that, by so doing, God would be unrighteous. This is the interpretation of Augustine, Hervæus, the majority of Lutheran writers, and Bullinger and Tholuck. But even this conclusion he rejects with abhorrence (comp. chap. iii. 5). He adduces his proof immediately afterwards.

Meyer remarks: "This reason is demonstrative, in so far as by it the absolute divine worthiness of what God predicates of himself must be assumed." Yet this would be only an absolute proof of authority. Also, according to Calvin, the proof lies in the refuting effect of the biblical declaration: *satis habet, scripturæ testimoniis impuros latratus compescere.** [In this choice and preference of the one before the other there is no unrighteousness. For he only is unrighteous who is under obligations which he does not fulfil; but God is under no obligations to His creature, hence can do with him what He will (vers. 14–29). God's will is the absolute and eternal norm of righteousness, and all that He does is necessarily right (Deut. xxxii. 4). There is no norm of righteousness above Him to which He is subject; else were God not God.—P. S.] For other explanations, see Tholuck, pp. 507, 508.

Tholuck: "Origen's regarding this as the objection of an opponent, and ver. 15 as the Apostle's answer, and vers. 16–18 as another objection of the opponent, is a result of doctrinal perplexity." Theodore of Mopsvestia, Storr [Jerome], and Flatt, regarded vers. 15–18, and Heumann, vers. 15–21, as the objection of an opponent. [Vers. 15 and 17 are quotations from the Scripture, and hence cannot be objections; while vers. 16 and 18 are not the incorrect deductions of an opponent from these passages, as Chrysostom and Pelagius suppose, but the correct conclusions of the Apostle himself.—P. S.]

Ver. 15. **For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion** [Ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτειρήσω ὃν ἂν οἰκτείρω.† See *Textual Note* [14], for the Hebrew]. An answer to the self-proposed objection in ver. 14, taken from Exod. xxxiii. 19, according to the LXX. The form of the original text is evidently this: I have (already) had mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I have had compassion on whom I will have compassion. The sense is therefore not: To whom I am gracious, to him I am gracious; that is, I act in the matter according to

* [Dr. Hodge considers this paragraph the statement and answer of the first objection arising against the doctrine that God is sovereign in the distribution of His favors, and that the ground of His selecting one and rejecting another is not their works, but His own good pleasure. A second objection, he thinks, is stated in ver. 19. So Meyer, Schaff, and most.—P

* [Hodge: "It will be remarked that these arguments of the Apostle are founded on two assumptions. The first is, that the Scriptures are the Word of God; and the second, that what God actually does cannot be unrighteous." —R.]

† [On the distinction between ἐλεῶ and οἰκτείρω, Meyer remarks: "The distinction between these two words is not to be thus defined, with Tittmann, *Synon.*, p. 69 f., that ἐλ. describes the active mercy, and οἰκτ. the sympathetic compassion; but rather, that the same notion of *misereri* is expressed *more strongly* by οἰκτ. The latter is originally the bewailing sympathy, contrasted with μακαρίζειν (Xen. *Anab.*, 3. 1. 19)."—R.]

my own authority or freedom, unrestrainedness (the view of most commentators, also of Tholuck, p. 511. Yet the latter thus modifies his view, against Olshausen: The question is not concerning God's right, but God's grace; p. 114), but: I remain just, as *Jehovah*, and continue the work of my grace where I have once revealed it, &c.—That is, Jehovah is the God of revelation in His consistency, and so are also His grace and His compassion consistent. His freedom binds or unbinds itself. His freedom is rather to be regarded as decision also. According to the connection, indeed, the וְחַנֹּתִי could be regarded as a future form; but this is hardly admissible in connection with the simple future form אָחֹן, and with the name Jehovah; therefore the Hebrew translations—for example, that of Philippson—are to no purpose: "And as I have mercy on whom I have mercy," &c.

In sense, the inverted form of the LXX., from which Paul quotes, is therefore correct: *καὶ ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, κ.τ.λ.* [Alford objects, without sufficent reason, to laying the stress on ὃν ἄν, *whomsoever;* but Paul, following the LXX., makes it the scriptural expression of general proposition. It is in the form of a Divine *axiom* (Meyer).—R.] The meaning of the name Jehovah is: *Divine consistency*. But Jehovah's speaking to Moses has a special significance. The Jews regarded Moses as the founder of righteousness by works. Paul, on the contrary, brings out the fact that God said to this very Moses, that the consistency of the work of grace is grounded on the beginning of the work of grace in free grace. [This view is ingenious, and gives at least some warrant for a reference to works, which too often is "all supplied by the commentator" (Hodge). But it can scarcely be accepted, as it seems to be rather an effort to avoid than to discover the meaning of the passage.—As regards the thought of Divine consistency, which seems to rest on the present tense in the relative clauses, it is scarcely proper to limit the meaning thus. Certainly Meyer does not often let a grammatical point escape him; yet he paraphrases: "'I will have mercy upon him who (in whatever given case) is the object of my mercy,' so that I am thereby dependent on nothing without myself. That is the sovereignty of the Divine will of mercy. Notice that the future is the mercy, proving itself in fact and act, which God accords in all those cases where He stands to the persons affected in the settled disposition (present ἐλεῶ) of mercy."—R.]

Ver. 16. **So then it is not of him who willeth,** &c. [*ἄρα οὖν τοῦ θέλοντος, κ.τ.λ.* On the construction, see Winer, p. 556.—Meyer: "From the saying of God, Paul deduces the inference lying therein respecting the causality of the Divine saving deliverance."—R.] That the entrance of human good conduct in faith is presupposed, follows not only from the analogy of Scripture, but also from the antithesis (ver. 17); though the Apostle here precludes the delusion that man, by his willing and running, can acquire that foundation of salvation which proceeds only from the freedom of the compassionate God. Meyer: "Incorrect, according to Locke, and most commentators; Reiche: *θέλοντ.* is probably chosen with regard to Abraham's wish to constitute Ishmael, and Isaac's wish to constitute Esau, the heir; but *τρέχ.* is chosen with regard to Esau's fruitless *running home* from hunting (Theophylact thought that it refers to his running to the hunt).* For Paul, by his *ἄρα οὖν*, draws his conclusion only from God's declaration promulgated to Moses." But, by this declaration to Moses, Paul proves that God was not unjust to Esau; that is, that God, acting in harmony with the application of that declaration to Judaism, does not now do any injustice to one who relies on righteousness by works. The willing and running are not rejected in themselves, but are elsewhere required according to the Divine call (1 Cor. ix. 24. Meyer even derives the *running* in this passage from the races, which ill suits the connection); it is only not recognized as the causality of the line of development. This causality is God's grace (the *ἐλεῶντος* must here be defined conformably to the preceding distinction between *ἐλεεῖν* and *οἰκτείρειν*).

[Paul obviously draws an inference from ver. 15, with *ἄρα οὖν*. The question is, How general is that inference? The verse is certainly general in form; any limitation must be found in the preceding context, or in the scope of the Apostle's argument. To limit it to Esau, as an illustration of God's method, is, in fact, to extend it, since Esau was not of the chosen people; and what God said to Moses, the head of the chosen people, could not be applicable to him, unless it was of general validity. To limit it to the Jewish people, because they are under discussion in this part of the Epistle, is forbidden by the fact that the instances or illustrations are outside that people (Esau, Pharaoh). The only safe view is, that the word to Moses is a Divine axiom, and this, an inference of universal application and validity. It will not interfere with human means in salvation; for, if true, it applies to willing and running in general, and yet it stops no volition and its accompanying *muscular* exertion. That side of the matter is not under consideration. Alford: "At present the Apostle is employed wholly in asserting the divine Sovereignty, the glorious vision of which it ill becomes us to distract by continual downward looks on this earth. It is most true that the *immediate subject* is the *national rejection* of the Jews; but we must consent to hold our reason in abeyance, if we do not recognize the inference, that the sovereign power and free election, here proved to belong to God, extend to *every exercise* of His mercy—whether temporal or spiritual, whether in Providence or in grace, whether national or individual. It is in parts of Scripture like this that we must be especially careful *not to fall short of what is written*—not to allow of any compromise of the plain and awful words of God's Spirit, for the sake of a caution which He himself does not teach us."—R.]

The antithesis of the consistency of free Divine grace, as experienced by Moses, is the consistency of Divine judgment as revealed in the case of Pharaoh.

Ver. 17. **For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh.** The *γάρ* announces the proof which arises from the uniformity of the same Divine dealing in its rejection. *The Scripture saith*, is a metonymy for *God saith according to the testimony of Scripture*. But the metonymy brings out prominently the fact that this declaration of God is not merely temporary and isolated, but has the force of a permanent scriptural declaration, which is applicable to

* [This is the interpretation of Watson, and many Arminian commentators. But it is not necessary to oppose a view so far-fetched, and forming such an anti-climax! —R.]

all analogous cases. The scriptural statement itself is in Exod. ix. 16.

[**Even for this very purpose have I raised thee up,** *εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε*. For the original Hebrew, and LXX., here altered, see *Textual Note* [16].—R.] If we look at the connection, Paul's translation, *ἐξήγειρά σε*, corresponds in sense to the original text, הֶעֱמַדְתִּיךָ, just as well as the *διετηρήθης* [LXX.] does, only it is more specific; from which consideration Meyer again educes a difference between the original sense of the Hebrew text and Paul's meaning. After the judgment of murrain and boils and blains (the fifth and sixth plagues) on Egypt, we read, as before: "The Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh," after it had already been said (Exod. viii. 15, 32): "Pharaoh hardened his heart;" and Moses must solemnly declare God's message to Pharaoh, which, according to the translation of Zunz, is as follows: "For I would already have stretched out my hand, and would have smitten thee and thy people with pestilence, so that thou wouldst be cut off from the earth. Yet I have allowed thee to exist on purpose to show thee my strength, and that my name may be extolled throughout all the earth." Evidently the translation *allow to exist* (also in Stier), is as much an enervation of the causal הֶעֱמִיד as that of the LXX. is, and probably the cause in this case is also the same hesitation in accepting the full strength of the thought.

The expression is chiefly used of positive setting up (for example, of statues), and then also of *arousing, awaking;* and even the weaker meaning of *allowing to exist* has still the sense of a positive support. According to Meyer, Paul makes the Scripture say: "'I have awakened thee;' that is, allowed thee to appear, to stand forth; thy whole historical appearance has therefore been effected by me," &c. This interpretation introduces a harsh fatalistic sense into the text; and though Meyer presents a series of expositors as saying the same thing, this proves incorrect in the case of the very first one, Theophylact, who says: *εἰς τὸ μέσον ἤγαγον*. Bengel: הֶעֱמִיד: *omnibus locis omnino præsupponit subjectum jam ante productum.* Philippi's explanation is: "I have awakened thee *to being*, let thee exist." Calvin's interpretation is strongest: *Deus Pharaonem a se profectum dicit, eique hanc impositam esse personam.*

The explanation: *vivum te servavi* (Grotius, Wolf, and others), at all events weakens the force; but it is not incorrect, since it follows from the connection: "I might have already destroyed thee, but, on the contrary, I have once more fully raised thee up." The interpretation, "I have raised thee up to opposition" (Augustine, De Wette [Haldane, Hodge: *have placed and continued thee as my adversary.* Alford: *pro dire fecit, excitavit.* Stuart: *have roused thee.*—R.], and others), has one feature of the context in its favor, namely, the circumstance that the word, according to the following *σκληρύνει*, appears to be used synonymously with this *σκληρύνει*. For, according to the sense, this idea is also comprised in the Apostle's translation, *ἐξήγειρά σε*; although this sense does not follow directly. He also presents no antithesis to the declaration: I could have cut thee off; the sense is rather: I have, so to speak, once more erected and raised thee up in thy hardened conduct from the judgment of death to which thou wast already subject, that I might show my power, &c.—To the more forcible construction of the Apostle there also corresponds the *εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο*, even to this end; instead of the weaker *ἕνεκεν τούτου* of the LXX.

[It is perhaps to be expected, that in the somewhat wide scope afforded to interpreters by the text of the Hebrew, LXX., and our passage, theological bias will largely determine the view of each. But Paul has chosen the stronger term, and uses it to establish a strong position (ver. 18, introduced by the inferential *ἄρα οὖν*). Hence, while we must utterly reject, both on lexical and theological grounds, the extreme supralapsarian view: *God created thee*—*i. e.*, as a hardened sinner; the view of Lange, and many modern interpreters, is too weak—is out of keeping both with the original transaction and the use here made of it. The view of Meyer (and also substantially of Theophylact, Beza, Calvin, Bengel, Reiche, Olshausen, Tholuck, Philippi, De Wette, Hofmann, Schaff, and many others) is perhaps most tenable, and is certainly accordant with the original passage. The objection that it is fatalistic, is an objection of too wide scope. Olshausen: "It by no means follows from this high view of the subject, that St. Paul intends to say that God has made Pharaoh evil by any positive operation; but he only means that God permitted that evil person, who of his own free will resisted all those rich workings of grace which were communicated in rich measure even to him, to come into manifestation at that time, and under these circumstances, in such a form that the very evil which was in him should serve for the furtherance of the kingdom of The Good and the glory of God." So Schaff: "All events of history, even all wicked deeds, stand under the guidance of God, without whose will not a hair falls from our heads, much less is a world-historical fact accomplished. God does not cause the evil, but He bends and guides it to His glory."—A too definite, and too weak view, though a modification of the correct one, is that of Flatt, Benecke, Glöckler, and Wordsworth: *placed thee as king.*—R.]

That I might show in thee my power, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. This is a strengthening generalization of the purpose, namely, that God will make Pharaoh, precisely in his opposition, a monument of His power (His majestic power), by allowing him to perish. Pharaoh, the hardened one, will only experience His crushing power and become a monument of it; but in the world, the glory of His name revealing itself in Pharaoh's case will be declared to Israel (see the Song of Moses, Exod. xv.).

Ver. 18. **Therefore on whom he will he hath mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth** [*ἄρα οὖν ὃν θέλει ἐλεεῖ, ὃν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει*]. This passage, if taken out of its connection, seems to declare an absolute predestination in the supralapsarian sense. Meyer, with others, protests against any mitigation of the sense: "Paul's simple and clear meaning is, that it depends upon God's free authority either to bless by His saving mercy, or to remove to that spiritual state in which one cannot be a subject of His saving grace, but only of His *ὀργή*." Of the two modes of view each of which, according to him, forbids the other—that Pharaoh in part produces his own hardness himself (Exod. viii. 15, 32; ix. 34), and that it in part seems to be wrought by God (Exod. iv. 21; vii. 3, &c.)—he makes the Apostle expressly follow the latter. [Meyer is perhaps unnecessarily harsh in his view, but he intimates that it suits the purpose of

the Apostle better to choose this aspect of the hardening, as this Pharaoh, *hardened by God*, is to him a type of the Jew resisting the gospel.—R.]

The usual mitigations of the passage are, at all events, insufficient, particularly the explanation: *though God permits hardening* (Origen, Grotius, and others), and also the interpretation of σκληρύνειν as *duriter tractare* (Carpzov, Semler, Beck, and others). Tholuck, without finally and positively adopting the latter of these, adduces many special grounds in its favor. [Against this untenable view of σκληρύνει, see Alford *in loco*. "The word here refers to a *hardening*, such a fortification in sin, that the sinner is unsusceptible of all workings of grace and better influences, the removal into a state where conversion is either absolutely impossible, or rendered difficult in the highest degree. This is an act of God, in so far as He has ordained the laws of the development of evil, 'that, propagating still, it brings forth evil,' (Schiller). It is here viewed as a punishment for a previous self-hardening of the sinner" (Schaff). So Hodge, who regards it as "the judicial abandonment of men 'to a reprobate mind,' a punitive withdrawing of the influences of His holy Spirit, and the giving them up to the uncounteracted operation of the hardening or perverting influences by which they are surrounded." So Wordsworth, but less strongly. If objection be made to such a judicial process as a work of God, then the same difficulty "lies in the *daily course of His providence*, in which we see this hardening process going on in the case of the prosperous ungodly man" (Alford). The facts remain, the solution is lacking, except so far as God plainly speaks in such passages as this. Meyer objects to the introduction of previous self-hardening here. See the clear and thoughtful note of Olshausen *in loco*.—R.]

Evidently, the context in Exod. ix. indicates a postponement of the well-merited judgment, in which postponement God's long-suffering is concurrent (comp. chap. xxiii.). The definite sense of the passage must be ascertained from the connection. We must here take into consideration the following:

1. Previously the question was, God's purposes preceding the birth of the children; here, on the contrary, it is the free will with which God dealt with fixed characters—Moses, on the one hand, Pharaoh, on the other. If this free will be referred to a purpose of God, it is nevertheless not the purpose of *election*, which first settles personality, but the purpose of *ordination*, which, in the establishment of its destiny, presupposes its conduct. Consequently, because this purpose is conditional, God is still left free to have mercy on the real Moses, just as He is free to harden the still existing Pharaoh.

2. As the ἐλεῶ must here be taken emphatically, and expresses the free consistency of Jehovah in His mercy to Moses until He can reveal His glory to him (see Exod. xxxiii. 19 ff.), so has also σκληρύνει the meaning of a continuation of the judgment of hardening to the extreme, in antithesis to the self-ripened judgment of retribution. The more strongly we here press the ὃν θέλει, the more will every notion of an abstract authority be excluded, and the stronger becomes the emphasis on the pure divinity of the θέλειν. [In other words, the more will the will of God, in its absolute freedom, appear, not as blind arbitrariness, which is the very reverse of freedom, but as a will of infinite love and wisdom. It proves itself such in the special cases from which the general proposition of this verse is drawn.—If θέλειν (as is claimed by Professor Hitchcock, Lange's *Comm.*, Eph. i. 9) always implies spontaneity, then the "will" here, in each case, finds its justification in the character of God, which immediately prompts it. This may be what Dr. Lange means by the "pure divinity of the θέλειν."—R.]

3. The whole of the immediate result of this fearfully significant expression is, that God, in His freedom, has mercy on Moses to the utmost, and has, to the utmost, led Pharaoh to judgment; that Moses can thereby make no just claim on the ground of the righteousness of works, and that Pharaoh can protest against nothing that he might regard as injustice done to him. In this way the justifiable use of the passage quoted by Paul is determined. [The *freedom of God* seems to be the main thought. The reference to the righteousness of works seems needless. Meyer concludes his exegesis of the passage thus: "Undoubtedly the will of God is just and holy, but it is not conceived and presented here from this point of view, but in its *independence of all human* θέλειν and τρέχειν, consequently in its simple self-origination (*Aseität*); which meaning is to be preserved in the clear sharpness of ὃν θέλει ἐλεεῖ." The words certainly favor this view; we need but guard against inferences, which are drawn, not by the Apostle, but by imperfect human logic. —R.]

THIRD PROOF: *God's freedom in the actual call to salvation* (vers. 19–29).

A. *The proof from the real relation* (vers. 19–24).

Tholuck regards this section as the collective carrying out of the thought, that the excluded one can bring no complaint against God, because he is left free in his conduct, &c.; but Meyer, on the contrary, regards vers. 19–21 as the third part of the theodicy: "Man is not entitled to reply against God by saying, 'Why doth He yet find fault?' For his relation to God is as that of the thing formed to him that formed it, or of the vessel to the potter, who has power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor." * Then he regards vers. 22–29 as the fourth part of the theodicy: "God has endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction, in order to make known His glory on the vessels of mercy, even us Christians, whom He hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles." We make the following distinction: In the first case, in vers. 6–13, the question was the freedom of God's election in antithesis to the human, and especially to the theocratic, right of inheritance. Then, in vers. 14–19, the question was, the freedom of God's *ordination* in antithesis to the claims of human righteousness by works (since even Moses himself, the lawgiver, did not merit mercy by the works of the law, and Pharaoh was visited by the judgment of hardening, instead of by the judgment of destruction which he had merited). The Apostle now passes over to God's freedom in His call.

[Whatever be the division adopted, or distinc

* [Olshausen: "The Apostle now introduces anew the unwise inquirer of ver. 14, in order to find an apology for himself in this operation of God, even in the forms of evil St. Paul abashes this arrogance with an appeal to the absolute character of God, with respect to whose ways the creature must render an unconditioned submission, even where he is not able to comprehend them."—R.]

tions made, there can be no doubt, that the objection the Apostle here raises and answers is one which arises at once against the freedom of God's will, viz., that it destroys our responsibility. As this was more likely to arise as an inference (οὖν, ver. 19, which seems to have troubled the transcribers, however) from what precedes, there is the greater ground for holding that the preceding verses refer to God's sovereignty, considered in the light of an objection (ver 14), and that this paragraph presents it in opposition to another (ver. 19). At all events, whatever limitations and special applications be made, the reader *now* deals with the passage (and subject) in this more general reference, and most commentators have felt obliged to treat it thus.—R.]

Ver. 19. **Thou wilt say then unto me** [ἐρεῖς μοι οὖν]. The conclusion which the Apostle allows the Jew to draw from the supposition that he has derived mercy and hardness from God's will, has been urged by thousands against Calvin's predestinarian system; and, indeed, they have done it with much better ground than the Jew could object to Paul's doctrine; yet they have also in many ways mistaken the infinite importance of the exercise of Divine authority in human guidance.

If the whole development of man is only an absolute Divine decree, the objection in ver. 19 says: **Why then doth he yet find fault?** [τί οὖν ἔτι μέμφεται; See *Textual Note* [16].] How, then, can God find fault with man, or rebuke him for being a sinner? By doing so, He would even contradict himself. The expression μέμφεται seems to be purposely chosen to bring out the authoritative character in a finding fault, in which the question cannot be a really objective relation to guilt. Tholuck: "Neither the charge against Pharaoh (Justin Martyr), nor that of the ungodly in the prophets (Zwingli, and others), is meant, but the rebuke of hardening brought against the Jews. Every penal declaration of revelation in general is meant, in so far as it would not be authorized by the doctrine of fate. The Jew does not here have in mind God himself, but that presupposition of the idea of God which Paul seems to present. But he nevertheless betrays the inclination of the one who relies upon the righteousnss of works to find fault with God. [In so far as one holds that notion of God, however derived, which in any way allows the possibility of His being the author of evil in man, this objection will arise. It cannot be confined to the Jew and his legal righteousness. (Meyer, De Wette, make the objection general, while Philippi finds in the sharp answer of ver. 20 a proof that the objector is a Jew.)—R.]

[For who resisteth his will? Τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκεν; Meyer renders βούλημα, which Paul uses only here, *das Gewollte—i. e., captum consilium.* It obviously implies deliberation, as βούλομαι does, when properly distinguished from θέλω.—R.] Though the ἀνθέστηκε has the present meaning, yet the form seems to indicate also the thought that God has already anticipated every attempt of human opposition. The Apostle does not hasten to refute the charge directly, by urging the truth of the relations of guilt, because this charge is based upon such a one-sided standpoint from the overrating of human action, that this human boasting must first of all be prostrated. Chap. iii. 5 ff. proves that he can also reply to a similar charge by an answer which brings out the ethical relations in harmony with the connection. But the first task presented to him here is, to go back with the quarrelsome Jew resting upon the righteousness of his works, to the absolute dependence of man on God.

Ver. 20. **Nay but, O man** [ὦ ἄνθρωπε, μενοῦνγε]. We translate the μενοῦνγε with Tholuck: *Much more;* Meyer construes it as irony: "Yes, indeed, O man." Its most probable use is to strengthen the thought: "*Just the opposite, O man,* &c. Thou sayest that God disputes with thee, and thou rather, in thy erroneous claims of right, darest to dispute with God." [Still better, Alford: "*Yea, rather*, taking the ground from under the previous assertion, and superseding it by another; implying that it has a certain show of truth, but that the proper view of the matter is yet to be stated. It thus conveys an intimation of rebuke; here with severity." Comp. chap. x. 18. Hodge: "Gross as is this perversion of the Apostle's doctrine on the part of the objector, Paul at first rebukes the spirit in which it is made, before he shows it to be unfounded."—R.] The ὦ ἄνθρωπε expresses already man's complete dependence on God; and this is increased by the σὺ τίς εἶ, **who art thou** [*quantulus es;* Meyer].

[That repliest against God, ὁ ἀνταποκρινόμενος τῷ θεῷ.] According to Theodore of Mopsvestia, Jerome, and others, Paul, in using the ἀνταποκρινόμενος, refutes his opponent by referring him to his own words. His opponent replies against God, and therefore opposes God, in the very moment in which he maintains that He cannot be opposed. In that case, indeed, μενοῦνγε would be ironical. This interpretation is ingenious, but too refined, and is opposed by the following words.

Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus? [Μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι, Τί με ἐποίησας οὕτως; An echo of, but scarcely a quotation from, Isa. xxix. 16, though the first clause is found word for word in the LXX.—R.] The explanation *tractasti* (Grotius, and others) is evasive. The *tertium comparationis* is the causality of him that forms, but here as the causality of the form. [It must be observed that even a pressing of the figure cannot make πλάσμα mean the *thing created;* the reference is not to original creation, but to the subsequent ethical moulding, from which, of course, must be excluded the mystery of universal sin referred to in chap. v. 12. That enters into the nature of the "clay" and the "lump" alike. Against Glöckler's *argumentatio a minore ad majus:* "If a thing moulded cannot thus speak, much less a man," &c., see Meyer *in loco.*—R.]

Ver. 21. **Hath not the potter power over the clay** [ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ. The order indicates the two emphatic thoughts: 1. That the human subjects under discussion are as "clay;" "his clay," would be a proper rendering. 2. That God *has power;* the definition of that power is given in the next clause —R.] Tholuck: "The potter's clay is regarded by infralapsarianism as the *massa jam perdita.* The vessels are not considered, as is observed by the Gl. ord. and Brenz, as naturally part silver and gold, and part dirt, but altogether dirt. Consequently, these expositors prefer the allusion to the Old Testament, Jer. xviii., where a people already ruined, which God forms into vessels of honor or dishonor according to its own conduct, is spoken of; the su

pralapsarians, on the contrary, as Thomasius, Estius, Calvin, and Gomarus, decide in favor of an allusion to Isa. xxix. or xlv. Supralapsarianism, to wit, regards the πηλός as the *massa absolute, qualis erat massa angelorum* (Estius) and the πλάσμα—which the meaning of the word is alleged to favor—as the product of the first creation." Tholuck finds in the simile only the sense expressed by Calvin: *Nullam dei arbitrio causam superiorem posse adduci*, &c. For the harsh expressions of Calvin, the still harsher ones of Zwingli, and the equally mild ones of Bullinger, see Tholuck, p. 528.

According to Arminius, and others, together with Lutherans, ver. 21 contains only a preliminary rejoinder; the real answer follows in vers. 22, 23. [It is indeed a preliminary, but one that "aims rather at striking dumb the objector by a statement of God's undoubted right, against which it does not become us men to murmur, than at unfolding to us the actual state of the case" (Alford). Comp. the emphatic order of the words.—R.] Besides, Arminians and Socinians have asserted that here Paul does not speak of "an election of individuals, but of classes—of believing Gentiles" (Tholuck).*

According to Tholuck, further, the principal question here is, What must we understand by the πηλός? If we regard the earthy clod as the real clay from which man was made, then the work of Him that formed may be transferred to the creation itself. According to this idea, indeed, the individual man is only "a specimen of the species." But if we regard God's breath as the real substance of man's formation, according to the biblical idea of personality, Calvinistic supralapsarianism is obviated.

[**Of the same lump to make,** ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι. The power of the potter is defined more closely by the infinitive. Fairness to the figure compels us to identify the "clay" and the "lump." The "clay" is the substance itself; the "lump" presents it as already in use by the potter for his purpose. Beyond this we cannot press it. Meyer perhaps goes too far, but certainly is justified in making the πηλός co-extensive with human nature. It must be borne in mind that the potter is not represented as making the "clay," or even the "lump," but as having power "over the clay," to make vessels "of the lump."—R.] The word here is not, as Meyer has properly remarked against Hofmann, *created*, but *made*. He understands by the φύραμα "the very same mass of human nature in and of itself." But we can just as little regard the *massa jam perdita* as merely the human race, prostrated in the ruin of the fall. In chap. xi. 16 the φύραμα is the Jewish people; and, according to ver. 24 of the present chapter, it is the same wretched state of the Jews and Gentiles at the time of Christ. God, as the Maker, *in His exercise of the efficacious call* (see ver. 24), has disposed of this φύραμα, first of all, of the Jewish people. [Granting this immediate reference, we must still avoid limiting the meaning of φύραμα. For even ver. 24 includes the Gentiles, while the discussion hitherto has embraced Ishmael, Esau, and Pharaoh.—R.]

* [This avoids, but does not meet, the difficulty. For it simply transfers to God's doings a distinction which in reality belongs only to our state of partial knowledge. With us, dealing with classes is often a mere convenience for avoiding the dealing with individuals. God's dealing with men always implies His thorough and minute as well as His comprehensive mode of action.—R.]

[**One vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor,** ὃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεῦος, ὃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν. Meyer calls attention to the position of εἰς τιμήν. Even here, in this strong assertion of "power," the preparation of the vessel for honorable use is emphasized.—R.] But as he that forms does not wantonly destroy his φύραμα, but, according to his own pleasure, makes of it vessels unto honor and unto dishonor—that is, vessels for honorable and vessels for dishonorable use—so also does God's exercise of authority as Maker go no further than to appoint a great difference between honorable and dishonorable vessels of His call, according to the personal conditions which have been established by the call corresponding to the necessity of salvation (2 Tim. ii. 20; 1 Cor. xii. 23). But the Apostle does not carry out his figure in this direction. He rather urges, only for a moment, the figure that God has the ἐξουσία, the free and full power, which is at the same time essentially the right, to make of the φύραμα, of His people [or, of all people, of the race] vessels unto honor and vessels unto dishonor; but then, in ver. 22, he turns to say that God has never made full use of this right; but that He has even endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath *which He found before Him*, His object being to make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy. In ver. 22 there is thus repeated the thought of the sentence awarded Pharaoh.

Preliminary note on the connection of vers. 22, 23. But how now? If God—notwithstanding His perfect power and His ready will to show forth His wrath and demonstrate His power—*has just as much adhered to himself* as formerly, when He suspended the judgment of destruction on Pharaoh, by enduring with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction, that He might make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy, which He had afore prepared unto δόξα—how does the case stand with the complaint that He makes an unrighteous use of His power? It is evident that the thought is presented here which is elaborated in chap. xi. In God's exercise of authority, judgment and long-suffering are united. His judgments are interpositions of long-suffering. In this sense God rules freely in His call, just as He has ruled freely in His election and ordination. With the explanation of the divine economy of the call, in vers. 21–24, the Apostle has also now refuted (in ver. 20) the charge that God is represented as an unrighteous God. He has therefore now proved the righteousness of divine ordination, vers. 15–18, from the righteousness of the divine call in ver. 20; just as he had already proved the righteousness of divine election (vers. 9–13) from the righteousness of divine ordination. The proof of the freedom of *election* lies in the fact that God is still free also in His *ordination*, and the proof of the freedom of His ordination lies in the fact that He is still free in His call.

But God's manner of using His freedom in these three stages testifies to the righteousness of His dealing.

1. His exclusion of Ishmael, gives an ethical character to the whole series of God's acts of freedom.

2. His hatred of Esau is only relative; it denotes the infinite difference between the two, by making the first-born theocratically subject to the younger.

3. It is plain, to one acquainted with the Scriptures, that God's hardening of Pharaoh resulted from Pharaoh's having hardened himself; and besides this, there is connected with this the additional fact that, even though Pharaoh was ripe for the judgment of destruction, God makes the useless man still useful by allowing him to exist longer, and by raising him up, in order, through him, to declare His power and His mercy. With the same consistency, He goes so far on the side of His exercise of mercy toward Moses, whose fidelity is well known to Israel, that He can reveal to him His glory, though it is in only a qualified manner.

4. He finally stood with the formative power of His call to salvation over the φύραμα of Israel prepared in the Old Testament, and could exercise His freedom by immediately allowing a Christianity to come from it, by virtue of which the whole φύραμα crumbled into vessels of honor and dishonor, if peradventure He allowed new wine to be poured into the old bottles, or the new cloth to be sewed into the old garment. But then it came to pass that another antithesis was prepared in the Israel of the apostolic age. The representatives of the φύραμα (not this merely) living at that time, had already transformed themselves in part into vessels of wrath, fitted to destruction; that is, to be broken to pieces (see Ps. ii.), but not to be worn out as vessels of dishonor; and the blessing of the Old Testament in part exhibited itself in them by their allowing themselves to be prepared by God as vessels of glory. And He was already about to break those vessels of wrath; but as He had once patiently made use of Pharaoh as a means of revealing His majesty and of declaring the glory of His name, so did He now endure in great long-suffering the vessels of wrath; and for this purpose, that their contradiction might be the means for the transferrence of salvation to the Gentiles, and for making known the riches of His glory on the vessels of His mercy. In brief, the turning-point was this: Instead of a φύραμα, which could have been simply used in the antithesis of vessels of honor and dishonor, He found that the developing process of the covenant people of the Old Testament had gone to such an extreme, that the people were divided into vessels of wrath and vessels of mercy; and instead of now making a stunted Jewish Christianity from the whole substance of the people, He established that economy of saving interposition explained by the Apostle in chaps. x. and xv.

Though Paul has principally allowed only the factors of the divine exercise of authority to appear, the ground for this was, that he had to establish the freedom of God's grace in relation to Judaism. But afterward he shows the righteousness of God in relation to the unbelief of most Israelites and the faith of the Gentiles.

Meyer remarks, in reference to the idea σκεῦος εἰς τιμήν: "It shall be either honored, so that it has τιμήν (as, for for example, a sacred vase); or else it shall experience the opposite, so that ἀτιμία adheres to it (as, for example, a vessel designed for a low and filthy use)." According to 2 Tim. ii. 20, the difference in material comes most prominently into consideration; but as far as the use is concerned, the antithesis of *sacred* and *unclean* will suffice. Tholuck emphasizes principally the antithesis: held in honor and in dishonor, but maintains that the simile is not adequate in the very chief point of comparison; the potter *moulds* the clay, but God is the *Creator* of the creature, therefore Pareus also speaks of a *comparatio a minori ad majus*. Yet it is incorrectly assumed here that the creation is spoken of.

The passage undoubtedly cited by Paul,* Isa. xxix. 16, refers to a people relying upon the righteousness of their works (ver. 13), on whom judgment is about to be visited (ver. 14), because they claim a false independence toward God in return for their service, as if God was related to them as an equal—as if the potter were equal with the clay, and the clay could say: "He has not made me," or, "He does not understand the matter." Besides, the vessels unto honor and unto dishonor must by no means be identified with the vessels of wrath and of mercy, which error has been committed by De Wette, Tholuck, Meyer, and others.

Ver 22. **But what if God, although willing to show, &c.** Εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ θεός, κ.τ.λ. [See *Textual Note* [10]. The question as to what should be supplied with εἰ δέ, is discussed below. Meyer suggests: "Wilt thou still venture this replying against God" (ver. 20).—R.] Two opposite explanations here present themselves: *because God would*, and *although God would*. The sense in the former case would be this: the μακροθυμία was also designed to enhance the penal judgment (De Wette, Rückert, [Calvin], and most commentators). But this cannot be the purpose of the μακροθυμία. Though the result is, that the judgment is enhanced (chap. ii. 4) by the abuse of the μακρ., yet this abuse must by no means be referred to the μακροθυμία. The translation *although God would*, adopted by Fritzsche, Philippi, and Meyer, is therefore preferable. [It may be added in favor of this view, that it gives to θέλων the meaning of willing—*i. e.*, spontaneous will. It was the will of God, growing out of His character, to show His wrath, &c., but He endured notwithstanding, &c. The other view takes the participle in the sense of *purposing*, which is too strong. The passage then presents another answer to the objection of injustice, by showing how the sovereign God had withheld the exercise of a power in accordance with His holy will. The position of θέλων, as Meyer remarks, prepares the way for the strong contrast with "long-suffering."—R.] If we look at the explanatory parallels in Pharaoh's history, the meaning becomes more definite: *although, and since already*; as God was already about to do. In Exod. ix. 15, God said to Pharaoh: "For now I will stretch out my hand." Likewise the aorists ἐνδείξασθαι, γνωρίσαι, indicate this readiness of judgment, not less than the expression σκεῦη ὀργῆς, and especially κατηρτισμένα. The expression: ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατόν,† in connection with the foregoing, forcibly calls to mind the declaration to Pharaoh.

Endured [ἤνεγκεν]. Chrysostom, De Wette, and others, have referred this to the long-forbearing with Pharaoh; but Meyer, on the other hand, is of the opinion that Paul means the previous time in general (which shall thus continue under this divine

* [It is more of an echo than a citation; hence there cannot be much stress laid upon the context in Isa. xxix. Certainly Paul, who is one of the freest generalizers from the Scripture texts he refers to, must not be limited here, where he has introduced such a variety of persons into his discussion.—R.]

† [τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ, *what was possible for Him, what He was in a condition to do.* Comp. chap. viii. 3 Meyer.—R.]

forbearance until the second coming of Christ). But it is evident from the connection, that the Apostle means the hardened portion of the Israelitish people. This is the view of Tholuck, with others: "The unbelieving Jews at Christ's time; there can only be a mere allusion to Pharaoh." For other views, see Tholuck.*

The whole passage in vers. 22, 23 has occasioned very great difficulty. The principal difficulty lies in the fact that it is not fully carried out; that is, that it is an aposiopesis. Augustine [so Stuart] observed this, and supplied a σὺ τίς εἶ from ver. 20; but the better supplement would be: μὴ ἀδικία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ; μὴ γένοιτο! in ver. 14; but the best of all would be chap. xi. 33.

The second difficulty lies in the brief expression καὶ ἵνα, which at once becomes clear by bringing over once more the ἤνεγκεν: *has also endured in order to*. For the different attempts at construction, see Tholuck (p. 535).

1. Καὶ γνωρίσαι, καὶ ἵνα γνωρίσῃ; the καὶ—καὶ just as well—as also (Nösselt, Baumgarten-Crusius). Tholuck says, on the contrary, that in that case it must read θέλων ἦν.

2. Our own construction. The καὶ ἵνα is connected to ἤνεγκεν, so that the latter expresses a double purpose (thus Calvin, Grotius, Winer, Meyer, and others).† Tholuck does not regard the connection by the mere καὶ as sufficient, and thinks, with Baumgarten-Crusius, that this construction does not present any clear thought. But the previous formation of this clear thought is already contained in Exod. ix. 15, 16.

3. Beza, Rückert, and Fritzsche, have connected καὶ ἵνα to the participial κατηρτισμένα: "those who are originally (!) appointed to destruction, for *the* purpose," &c. The καὶ would thus be epexegetical, which is Calvin's view of the thought; but the κατηρτισμ. is totally misconstrued. Tholuck proceeds, with Philippi, from the unwarranted supposition, that the Apostle is expected to treat uniformly of God's dealings in relation to the σκεύη εἰς ἀτιμίαν and to the εἰς τιμήν; he requires, accordingly, the acceptation of a double anacoluthon. "Mentally, the Apostle must have written," &c. Philippi interprets similarly. (See Meyer [p. 380, 4th ed.], on the contrary). On the constructions of Hofmann, Bengel, Schöttgen, and Beck, see Tholuck, p. 533 ff.

With much long-suffering [ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ]. On the obscurity of the idea of μακροθυμία in Calvin, Hofmann, and others (as only meaning *waiting for*), see Tholuck, p. 536. [The immediate end of the long-suffering is undoubtedly to lead to repentance (comp. chap. ii. 4; 2 Peter iii. 9, 15). But, as Alford intimates, this is a mystery we cannot fathom.—R.]

Vessels of wrath [σκεύη ὀργῆς. Without the article. Not some, but those in general, limited, however, by the clause immediately following. The absence of the article seems also to favor Lange's distinction between "vessels unto dishonor" and "vessels of wrath."—R.] Meyer: *Vessels full of Divine wrath*. Totally foreign to the figure! Vessels filled with Divine wrath would be very holy and honorable, as is the case with the vials of wrath in the hand of the angels, in John's Revelation. De Wette and Tholuck correctly expain: Objects of divine wrath. [So Stuart, Hodge. The latter takes the phrase as a modification of "vessels unto dishonor" (ver. 21).—R.] The figure in Ps. ii. 9 is undoubtedly closely connected with the Apostle's thought.

Fitted for destruction [κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν. This is the end for which they are fitted; the divine ὀργή is accomplished in the ἀπώλεια.—R.] Meyer: "But the subject who has fitted them for the ἀπώλεια is God (see ver. 20 f.), and the insertion of any clause by which it should follow that they had fitted themselves for destruction (see Chrysostom, Theodoret, Œcumenius, and Theophylact) is contrary to both the word and the context (likewise Tholuck and De Wette)." But apart from the fact that, according to Ps. ii., God *breaks* the vessels of wrath, but does not *make* them, the very decided change of the verb as well as of the tense (κατηρτισμένα; ἃ προητοίμασεν) should guard the exegetical author, who usually holds so tenaciously to the letter, against this conclusion. It is a much bolder leap from the thought: God has the *power* to make vessels unto dishonor, to the thought that He *has made the vessels of wrath*. In the Apostle's choice of verbs he presents three antitheses, which may well serve as a warning to the expositor.

1. The verbs themselves are different: in καταρτίζειν, the idea of making *ready* predominates (to make fitting, to prepare fully); but in the expression προετοιμάζειν, on the contrary, the idea of the previous preparation predominates.

2. The former word is put in the perfect, and (which strengthens the matter) also in the participle; but the latter, being in the form of the aorist, is much less conclusive.

3. The former stands irrelatively in the passive; but the latter, as activity, is referred definitely to God. Such antitheses as these cannot be dusted off by the brush of mere assurance. Therefore a third explanation takes its place beside the two foregoing ones. According to this last, the perfect passive participle must be read as a verbal adjective: prepared, ready, as in Luke vi. 40, &c. (Grotius, Calovius, Beck). The Apostle has probably chosen this form, because this *being ready* certainly arises from a continual reciprocal action between human sin and the Divine judgment of blindness and hardness. De Wette has an uncertain surmise of this relation: "The mixture of two different modes of view—the moral and the absolute—undoubtedly occurs here. It must also be granted that the Apostle avoids saying: ἃ κατήρτισε εἰς ἀπώλειαν (Bengel)." The "two different modes of view" are reduced to one, according to which every development of sin is a network of human offences and Divine judgments

* [The more general reference is to be preferred, and, in any case, it is implied; for all ante-Christian history must be viewed as long-suffering forbearance in preparation for the great revelation of mercy. Comp. all the more modern conceptions of ancient history.—R.]

† [Alford agrees substantially with this view, but prefers to supply: "what if this took place," this ὃν θέλει, ἐλεεῖ. So Ewald. Dr. Hodge joins the clause with θέλων, or rather supplies θέλων, which is not only objectionable on the grounds he states himself, but untenable, if the sense be: *although willing*. Stuart takes a somewhat different view of the syntax of the passage, and paraphrases the whole: "If God, in order that He might exhibit His primitive justice and sovereign power, endures with much long-suffering the wickedness of the impenitent and rebellious who are worthy of His divine indignation; and if He has determined to exhibit His rich grace toward the subjects of His mercy whom He has prepared for glory, even toward us whom He has called, Gentiles as well as Jews; who art thou," &c. This gives too strong a meaning to θέλων, and is not so justifiable grammatically as the view of Meyer and Lange.—R.]

that are related to each other as chain and clasp.* The poet knew something more of the matter than many theologians, when he wrote: "This is the very curse of evil deed," &c.; † provided the curse is not taken as a mere phrase.

Ver. 23. **And that he might make known the riches,** &c. [καὶ ἵνα γνωρίσῃ τὸν πλοῦτον, κ.τ.λ. As intimated above, this clause should be connected (Winer, p. 580) with *endured. Καί, also.* This was a second purpose of God's endurance, undoubtedly the more important one. Ἵνα is of course telic.—Τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. The divine majesty in its beneficent glory. Bengel: *Bonitatis, gratiæ, misericordiæ, sapientiæ, omnipotentiæ.*—R.] The riches of glory form the antithesis to another miserable train of development which Christianity could conceivably have taken within the Jewish nationality. The riches of glory are the train of development which God has actually taken, the course of the unlimited universality of evangelization, to the wonderful blessing of which, in the conversion of the Gentiles, the Apostle ever reverts with rapt adoration (chap. x. 11; Eph. iii. 5–10; Col. i. 6, 20 ff.).

According to Calvin, the πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης should be so regarded that by the *interitus improborum eo luculentius divinæ bonitatis, erga electos amplitudo* should be strengthened. According to the explanation of the Remonstrants, the *liberalitas* of God should be made known on the vessels of mercy, by the comparison of this mercy with the patient endurance with the vessels of wrath. According to Fritzsche, the purpose of sparing the Jews was, that many of them might be converted before the second coming of Christ. But this overlooks ver. 24, according to which the vessels of mercy are only partly among the Jews.‡ Meyer must also here mix up the second coming of Christ, which he everywhere brings in, just as Dr. Baur does Clemens Romanus. "If, namely, God had not so patiently endured the σκεύη ὀργῆς, but had already permitted His penal judgment to be inflicted upon them (which must be regarded together with the second coming), He would have had no period to declare His glory to σκεύεσι ἐλέους." That is, the final judgment, as the end of the period of mercy, would have been present with the complete penal judgment of Israel. The destruction of Jerusalem has certainly become a type of the end of the world, but not the end of the world itself. The Apostle presents us with an excellent exegesis of his own language, in chap. xi. 11, 25; Acts xiii. 46, and also in other passages.

[**On vessels of mercy,** ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέους. Not *to* (De Wette), but *toward, with regard to*, depending on πλοῦτον (Alford). The making known is represented by the preposition as stretching itself over the men who are its objects (Meyer). The latter is preferable. We have no right to limit the "vessels of mercy" to any period. The preceding context would extend the reference to the times of Pharaoh; ver. 24 extends it indefinitely into the Christian dispensation.—R.]

Which he before prepared for glory [ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν. The verb is aorist, and refers to a definite past act. The two meanings suggested by Hodge: (1.) predestined; (2.) prepared by providence and grace (also that of Olshausen), are both objectionable. (1.) Because it is not the proper meaning of the word; (2.) because this is a continued work, and would be indicated by the perfect, as was the "fitted" of ver. 22. It probably refers to the actual constitution of the individual, as clay in the hands of the potter, the result of election, yet distinct from it.—There is no necessity for limiting δόξα to "the glory of the new covenant." Its antithesis, "destruction," shows that it means the full and eternal glory of the kingdom of heaven.—R.] Tholuck translates, "which he had prepared unto glory from eternity," and remarks thereon, that, from the circumstance that the κατηρτισμένα does not have the προ before it, it follows that Paul could have thought only of a *decretum electionis*, but not *reprobationis*. [So Schaff.] Tholuck cites, in favor of this explanation, Eph. ii. 10; Matt. xxiv. 34; Book of Wisdom viii. 9.

We must remark, in relation to the middle passage, that the expression: Βασιλεία προετοιμασμένη ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου must not be confounded with πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμ. From the foundation of the world, through all time, God has labored for the preparation of the βασιλεία. The thought, God has *chosen* us before the foundation of the world, is also totally different from the infeasible thought, that He prepared us for glory before the foundation of the world. The two other passages are equally undemonstrative. Meyer explains, more correctly, thus: God formed the σκεύη ἐλέους therefor beforehand, before He declared His glory on them. But the general statement has also its historical relation on this side. As the true children of faith among the Jews came out from the pedagogical exclusion under the law (Gal. iii. 23), they found themselves already prepared for the glory of the new covenant, and the preparatory mercy had operated in this direction on even many of the Gentiles (chap. ii. 14, 15). The πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης came over them like the rising of a spiritual sun—ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέους, the vessels which were subjects of mercy—and went far beyond them in the evangelization of the Gentile world (see Isa. ix. 2).

[The paraphrase of Meyer (vers. 22, 23) is appended, as a clear *resumé* of the exegesis, for the most part supported in the notes above. "But if God, notwithstanding His holy will leads Him, not to allow His anger and His power to remain unproven, but to make it known in act, has yet, with great long-suffering, endured such as were objects of His wrath, and spared them the destruction, into which they are, however, fitted and prepared to fall, as a vessel from the potter—endured and spared not merely as a proof of such great long-suffering *toward them*, but also with the purpose of making known, during the continuance of this forbearance, the fulness of His glorious perfection upon *such* as are objects of His mercy, whom He had before prepared, as a potter a vessel, and enabled for eternal glory." R.]

* [Stuart and Alford adopt the stronger view as inherent "in *any consistent belief of an omnipotent and omniscient God;*" Dr. Hodge gives both, without definitely accepting either. Schaff deems the stronger view the more natural one, but guards it, as must be done, against supra-lapsarianism, &c. But the differences noted by Dr. Lange must be carefully kept in view, as themselves guarding against erroneous inferences.—R.]

† ["*Das* EBEN *ist der Fluch der bösen That*
Das sie, fortzeugend, immer Böses muss gebären."
This quotation, almost a proverb in German literature, is from Schiller, *Die Piccolomini*, V. *Aufz.*, 1 *Auftr.* Coleridge, who has taken some liberties in arrangement, puts it in Act iii. Scene 1.—R.]

‡ [The advantage of a general reference throughout the passage is apparent here. The *making known* is something which occurs not once, but throughout the whole gospel dispensation, as ver. 24 requires.—R.]

Ver. 24. **As such he also called us, &c.** [οὓς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς, κ.τ.λ. Οὓς, *of which kind, quales* (Alford). *As such* vessels of mercy, *he also*, besides preparing, *called us*. He prepared us among these vessels of mercy, and, as such, has also called us, Jews and Gentiles. Stuart would supply here ἠλέησε, *He showed mercy* to us; but this is unnecessary in our view of the passage. —R.] We have already brought out the meaning of the ἐκάλεσεν in this passage. It denotes the fundamental thought of vers. 21–23, God's freedom in the economy of His call. Even us *whom;* namely, even such vessels of mercy; or *they, even whom.* That is, in this characteristic He has also *called* us (not us also) as vessels of mercy. Because He had in mind only objects of mercy, but not the probable legitimate heirs, He could, consistently with His mercy, conformably to His preparatory mercy, really *call* us:

Not from among the Jews only, but also from among the Gentiles. ['Ἐξ, *from among.* Bengel notes the reference to the call of the Jew as: "*Non eo ipso vocatus, quod Judæus est, sed ex Judæis.*" Hodge: "How naturally does the Apostle here return to the main subject of discussion! How skilfully is the conclusion brought out at which he has continually aimed!"—R.]

B. *The third proof, corroborated by witnesses of the Old Testament* (vers. 25–29).*

Ver. 25. **As he saith also in Hosea** [ὡς καὶ ἐν, κ.τ.λ. See *Textual Note* [21], for the Hebrew text. Alford suggests, very properly, that καὶ implies "that the matter in hand was not that directly prophesied in the citation, but one analogous to it." See below.—R.] The call of believing Gentiles is not only a *New Testament* fact, but is also attested previously in the *Old Testament.—In Hosea;* that is, in the Book of Hosea.—The first quotation is Hosea ii. 23: "And I will say to them which were *not my people* (see Hosea i. 9), *Thou art my people;* and they shall say, Thou art *my God.*" Paul has changed the ἐρῶ of the original text and the LXX. into καλέσω, which, according to Fritzsche and Meyer, should mean, *I will call.* Tholuck, on the contrary, properly observes that the naming of them already comprises the call. Paul has also left out the addition, irrelevant in this connection: "And they shall say, 'Thou art my God;'" while, on the other hand, he has, in conformity with the sense, correctly supplied the clause καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην, κ.τ.λ., in harmony with Hosea i. 6, referred to Hosea ii. 23.†

Ver. 26. **And it shall come to pass, that in the place.** [See *Textual Note* [22].] In order to understand the whole argumentative force of this citation, we must, like the Apostle, connect the second citation, Hosea ii. 1 (LXX. i. 10), with the first (and this is simply an exegesis according to the analogy of Scripture, as we frequently find in Paul). The Apostle, designing to emphasize the word בִּמְקוֹם, brings it out once more in his conclusion: ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται, κ.τ.λ. Hitzig explains the expression: *in the place,* by *instead of.* According to Meyer, the prophet meant by this expression the locality of the Gentiles, the Gentile lands; but Paul understood by it, Palestine. That the expression denotes the stay of the Jews in the Gentile world, is proved by Hosea i. 11: "Then shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head, and *they shall come up out of the land.*" It is just on this point that the weight of the proof rests. The call will be published to them among the Gentiles, therefore among the "*no-people,*" among whom they themselves are scattered as "*no-people.*"

According to Meyer, Paul finds the demonstrative force of the two passages in the fact, that he perceives the mercy shown to the ten tribes as a type of the reception of the Gentiles to salvation. According to Tholuck, his proof rests upon the hermeneutics of the Jewish exposition. This "was accustomed to refer biblical declarations, according to the law of ideal analogy, to such subjects also as are comprehended in the same category" (see p. 541).* It must be assumed that the decision: "*not my people,*" has placed the Jews among the Gentiles, and that the decision: *Lo-Ruhamah,* has adjudged them to be a very intractable people even among the Gentiles themselves. If, now, the call to salvation is published to this *not my people,* in the midst of the Jews, then it has a creative, original meaning; it is not published to Israel as God's people, but it creates for itself a people of God from the mixed "*no-people*" of the Jews and of the Gentiles. According to the typical construction, De Wette has referred the τόπος to the ideal state or divine kingdom, and Fritzsche to the *cœtus Cristianorum.* Yet, according to the connection, this locality means the equalization of Jews and Gentiles in one common need of mercy.

Ver. 27. **And Isaiah cries also concerning Israel, Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved.** [Vers. 27 and 28 contain a quotation from Isa. x. 22, 23; the verses being divided differently, however. The original reference was undoubtedly to the return from Babylon. Here, however, the emphasis is laid on *remnant,* mainly with reference to the call of the Gentiles, though perhaps not without a secondary reference to the future salvation of Israel—a premonition of chap. xi.—R.] That the question in the foregoing was the call of the Gentiles (the Jews, of course, included, in so far as they have sunk into heathendom), and not the call of the Jewish people, as Hofmann holds, is proved by the verse which now follows—a quotation from Isa. x. 22, nearly according to the LXX. The Apostle here emphasizes the *remnant,* as he has emphasized *the Gentile land* in the foregoing passage. Only a remnant of Israel,

* The reference is undoubtedly to the symbolical names given by the prophet to a son and daughter (chap. i. 6, 9): *Lo-Ammi* (not my people) and *Lo-Ruhamah* (not having obtained mercy). In order of birth the latter stands first, as well as in the passage cited. This is natural, as visible deprivation of mercy precedes visible rejection as a people. The Apostle inverts the order, however, perhaps because the prominent thought for his purpose was: *not my people,* &c.—R.]

† [Dr. Hodge makes of vers. 25–33 a distinct section, in which the Apostle confirms the position of the preceding section (the freedom of God in selecting the objects of His mercy) by declarations of the Old Testament (1.) vers. 25, 26. Aliens were to be included in the kingdom of God; (2.) Only a small portion of the Israelites should attain to these blessings; vers. 27–29; hence the Gentiles are called, and the Jews as Jews rejected; vers. 30, 31. The reason of their rejection was refusal to submit to gospel terms of salvation; ver. 32. As predicted, they were offended at their Messiah; ver. 33.—R.]

* [So Hodge, Stuart, substantially. For a discussion of Paul's analogical use of Old Testament events and citations, the reader is referred to Lange's *Comm. Gal.* pp. 113 ff., 120 ff.—R.]

τὸ ὑπόλειμμα, will be saved. The LXX. translated the original יָשׁוּב: *will return, be converted*, by σωθήσεται, in the sense of *will be saved*, though in a more restricted sense than Paul intends. The term *remnant* is of all the more weight, as it stands in contrast with the declaration, "though thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea." Similar passages: Isa. lxv. 8, 9; Mal. iii. 2; iv. 1.—The crying, κράζει, describes the bold declaration of a truth very offensive to the people.

Ver. 28. [**For he is finishing the word, and cutting it short in righteousness; because a short word will the Lord make upon the earth.** *Λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ· ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον ποιήσει κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.* See *Textual Notes* [24, 25, 26]. Lange renders: *For He who consummates the reckoning, is also he who limits it in righteousness. Yea, a restrained work will the Lord carry out on the earth.* Against this view, see below.—R.] Zunz translates the following words of the same quotation, כִּלָּיוֹן חָרוּץ, &c., thus: "The ruin is decreed, righteousness overflows. For the Lord, the God of Hosts, executes a firmly determined desolation in the midst of all the land." The LXX. has translated: λόγον συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον κύριος ποιήσει ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ. Paul follows this in the main, with the exception of the last words.

It may now be asked, Has the LXX. translated incorrectly, and has Paul incorrectly quoted from it, under the supposition that this translation corresponds better to his purpose? (see Tholuck, pp. 542 ff.) כָּלָה means, first of all, *completion*, consummation, and concurs with the λόγος in the idea of *settlement* (see the LXX., 1 Macc. x. 40, 42, 44). Accordingly, כִּלָּיוֹן also means the judgment of destruction in the sense of settlement. Now the LXX. translates the first clause thus: "*He who has determined the settlement* (the same as the final judgment) *is the same who limits it, cuts it short in righteousness;* so that a remnant can be left from the destruction." We read the καὶ συντέμνων as a conclusion with ἐστί, and understand by righteousness, not penal righteousness, but righteous restraint in punishing, according to the saving purpose of righteousness, whose highest glory does not consist in inexorable rigor.

This translation is undoubtedly exegetical. First, it takes over Adonai, the subject of the following clause, in order to bring back the definition of the first clause to the defining clause. Then it does not explain the שׁוֹטֵף צְדָקָה as a higher degree of the first term כִּלָּיוֹן חָרוּץ, but, antithetically, as a mitigation, which is even already indicated in the חָרוּץ. This exegesis will be perceived from the sense, also, to be altogether correct. *Destruction* is defined as *settlement*, but therewith also cut short; *overflowing* (restraining itself) *with righteous mildness, deliverance.* The word צְדָקָה frequently has the sense of mildness, of righteousness, as fairness in its saving effect. The verb שָׁטַף is here transitive. See Gesenius, *Lexicon.* On συντέμνειν, see the *Lexicon.* This translation is further in harmony with the connection which gives prominence to precisely this thought, that a remnant shall be saved from the decreed judgment.* The "shortened days," in Matt xxiv. 22, denote the same thing. See the *Commentary on Matthew* [Amer. ed., pp. 425, 426].

The second clause changes the maxim of divine government declared in the first clause, according to which, judgment always brings a deliverance, into a declaration; here the word of the LXX. is explained of itself by the foregoing: for the Lord will effect a *shortened*, that is, a *moderated* settlement in the whole world, or, as Paul says in a more general way, *upon the earth.* Now there seems to be no support for the συντετμημένον in the original text. But the niphal participle נֶחֱרָצָה like the substantive נֶחֱרָצָה, does not by any means denote in turn, like כָּלָה, the penal judgment in itself, but the definiteness and fixed limitation of the penal judgment. Thus the word וְנֶחֱרָצָה after כָּלָה, in Isa. xxviii. 22, evidently serves to express the limitation of the judgment, *as is plain from the explanation in vers.* 23–29. (Ver. 28: *He will not ever be threshing it.*) Therefore the Vulgate properly translates *consummationem et abbreviationem audivi;* according to the Septuagint, συντετελεσμένα καὶ συντετμημένα πράγματα ἤκουσα. Comp. also Dan. ix. 27; xi. 36. From this it follows that in the חָרוּץ, in the first member of Paul's citation, there is comprised not merely the close, but also the limiting conclusion of the judgment of destruction.

According to Meyer (and Fritzsche), the LXX. exhibits an ignorance of the passage, yet Paul found the sense of the translation suited for his purpose. In consequence of a defective construction, the word λόγος has been differently explained: *purpose;* fact; *dictum.* According to Meyer, the λόγον συντετμ. signifies the shortest possible consummation of the λόγος. Tholuck: "The Lord will execute an exactly defined declaration." (On the usual opinions on Paul's quotations, see Tholuck's *Note* on p. 543. See also the account of the different expositions of the present passage; for example, the patristic one of Chrysostom, Augustine, and others, that λόγος συντετμ. is the gospel as an abridged doctrine of salvation, in antithesis to the elaborateness of the Old Testament).* Luther's translation of the present passage is very inexact,† but it is

* [Yet the emphasis, as will appear from the notes on ver. 27, is not upon the *salvation* of the remnant, but upon the fact that *only a remnant* will be saved. Nor does the remoter context favor such a mitigated view. It is not in accordance with the passage cited from Hosea, nor with ver. 24, still less with vers. 30–33.—R.]

* [Alford seems to include both promise and threatening in λόγος, and makes the object of the citation a confirmation of "the certainty of the salvation of the remnant of Israel, seeing that now, as then, He, with whom a thousand years are as a day, will swiftly accomplish His prophetic word in righteousness."

As a curious specimen of interpretation, that of Wordsworth is appended: "There seems to be here in the mind of the prophet a contrast between the *paucity* of the *numbers* to which the Israelites are to be reduced, and the *abundance* of *righteousness* vouchsafed to them. The quantity will be small, but the quality will be good. The LXX. gives a paraphrase (not a literal translation) which embodies this sense, and which is adopted by the Apostle.

"The word λόγος, as used by them, appears to signify an *account* or *reckoning*, and, derivatively, a sum or catalogue of people. The sense, therefore, is: 'Summing up and cutting short the *reckoning*.' The λόγος is the account or muster-roll of the people. The census of the Israelites will be *cut short* to a *small number*, but the smallness of the number will be amply compensated by the *righteousness* with which God will endue it by virtue of its *faith* in Christ." A method of exegesis like this compensates for the discovery of so many things not in the text, by omitting so much that is there.—R.]

† ["*Denn es wird ein Verderben und Steuern geschehen*

more in harmony with the sense than the more recent explanations.

[Few verses present such a combination of difficulties as this one.

(1.) *Critically*, the text is in doubt. See *Textual Note* [26], where the longer reading of the *Rec.* is accepted (against such careful critics as Lachmann, Alford, Tregelles).

(2.) The LXX. seems to have departed from the sense of the Hebrew original. Paul varies from the former, but not materially; thus endorsing what is deemed by many an incorrect rendering of the Word of God. Out of this grows the difficult exegetical problem of getting the sense of the Hebrew out of the Greek words (which seems to be Dr. Lange's endeavor), or the equally difficult solution of the strange fact, that an apostle would choose such an altered version of the Hebrew.

(3.) This state of things has encouraged expositors in departing almost at pleasure from the obvious meaning of Paul's words, while it has not led them to adopt the obvious meaning of the words of the prophet. Dr. Lange has chosen an ingenious interpretation, with a view of discovering in the passage a declaration of forbearance on the part of God. It is open to lexical objections (see below), and is not in accordance with the context; since the only verse which intimates a kindred thought is ver. 22, while the immediate connection is rendering the opposite thought very prominent.

The only method which seems fair in dealing with any author when he quotes, is to take it for granted that he quotes wittingly, and then to interpret his citation, making the original passage, especially when used through the medium of a translation, entirely subordinate. The interpretation then becomes a simple exegetical question. What, then, does Paul say here, as his view of the meaning of the prophet's words?

(*a.*) *Λόγον*, *word, saying*. It does not mean *work* (E. V.). Many render: *decree*. Doubtless this idea underlies the passage, and is found in the Hebrew, but the Greek word never means this. It is better, then, to render *word* (*i. e.*, of promise or threatening, probably both—threatening to the mass of the people, promise to the remnant). This is the view of many of the best modern commentators, although they differ as to the precise reference.

(*b.*) *Συντέμνων, συντετμημένον*. The verb (only here in the New Testament) means *to cut short, to finish rapidly*. It obviously refers to the rapid accomplishment of what God has said. It seems, then, altogether unnecessary to find in the rapid accomplishment of what God says, an indication of something different from what He says—*i. e.*, that this quick fulfilment of wrath is an exhibition of mercy to those who are its objects. This is Dr. Lange's position. Admitting that "in righteousness" includes God's mercy to the chosen remnant, that does not imply "mitigation of judgment" to the apostate mass. Nor is it necessary to find a different meaning for the word in the second clause, though such a variation can be justified. We render, therefore: *is cutting short*, and *cut short*, supplying *ἐστι* (with the present participles; Meyer, and others).

(*c.*) *Ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ* is referred most naturally to the judicial justice of God, which punishes, in order to save the remnant. The former thought is the prominent one, as we infer both from the context here, and from the original. The sense of the whole verse then is: *He* (*i. e.*, the Lord) *is finishing and cutting short the word* (making it a fact by rapid accomplishment) *in righteousness, for a cut-short word* (one rapidly accomplished) *will the Lord make* (execute, render actual) *upon the earth*. This is, in the main, Meyer's rendering. While the original reference was to the Jews in the times of Isaiah, the Apostle here makes the prophecy of more general validity, referring it to the sad fact that most of the Jews were cut off (so Hodge), though including the other fact, that the remnant should be saved, both sides supporting the general thought of the chapter. Dr. Lange at last comes to nearly the same view. The question then arises, Is this at all in keeping with the words of the prophet himself? A comparison will show that it preserves the spirit of Isaiah's language most fully, and actually conveys to the reader's mind a clearer sense than a literal rendering of the Hebrew would do. Hence he used the LXX., and (as all authors do) inserted such unimportant words as would make its language conform to the use for which he designed it.—R.]

The prophet has uttered a twofold truth in the quotation; first, that *only* a remnant will be left from the great judgment of destruction, but then that this remnant shall be preserved in security. The Apostle, in vers. 27 and 28, has brought into prominence this first feature, but without altogether excluding the second. This latter is proved by the remaining part of his citation.

Ver. 29. **And, as Isaiah hath said**, or **prophesied** (Isa. i. 9), &c. [*καί, καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἡσαΐας, κ.τ.λ.* We give the pointing of Meyer (a comma after *καί*). The meaning then is: *And*, as Isaiah has already said (so I appropriate his words), *Except*, &c. See below, however. If it be objected, that this gives to the verb the unusual sense of *prophesy*, it will be seen that this is not the necessary meaning of *has already said*. The introduction of *καθώς* calls for some such paraphrase, and the *πρό* seems to refer to the *time* of the Apostle, rather than to the *place* of the last citation. Besides, the propriety of a direct adoption by the Apostle appears both from the use of the first person, and the quasi-prophetic character of the application Paul makes of the passage here.—R.] The explanation: he has already said, namely, in an earlier chapter (Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, and others), is opposed by Tholuck, and others, with the remark, that such a reference to earlier passages is without an analogy in the Apostle's constant quotation *memoriter*. Against this explanation, at all events, is the Apostle's design of returning to the fact of the present condition of believing Israel; so that he seems to construe the prophet's declaration chiefly as a typical prophecy. But that passage is immediately more than a description of an existing condition; it is a vision of an immeasurable ruin extending to the future,* as the passage, Isa. vi. 9;

der Gerechtigkeit, und der Herr wird dasselbige Steuern thun auf Erden."—R.]

* [Dr. Drechsler remarks on Isa. i. 9 (*Der Prophet Jesaja*, i. p. 84): "The prophet with a few ground-strokes gathers up the whole future of the people of Israel. He announces a period of judgment as an unavoidable passage-way; then, again, a time of salvation. But the period of judgment comprehends in itself all the judgments then standing without as yet: every visitation, of which history from that time on knows aught, is a proof of this word of prophecy, a fulfilment of it. . . . Just so is the period of salvation conceived as the sum-total of all fulfilment in general,

comp. Matt. xiii. 15; John xii. 39 ff.; Acts xxviii. 26, 27; 2 Cor. iii., xiv. ff. It may be asked, whether we would read καὶ ἔστι καθὼς Ἡσ. &c.: It stands thus, as Isaiah has prophesied, or: *And*—as Isaiah has prophesied—Except, &c. Meyer defends the latter construction; but we prefer the former, because the Apostle designs to adduce this quoted expression, like the former and the following one, as an expressive prophetical declaration. The term σπέρμα means the κατάλειμμα, as well in its external smallness as in its inward importance for the future. The Septuagint has translated the שָׂרִיד of the original text by σπέρμα.* Compare Isa. lxv. 8.

Fourth Proof: *The correspondence between God's freedom in His government with the freedom of men in their faith or unbelief. The stability of the fact that the Gentiles believe, and Israel, in its popular totality, does not believe* (vers. 30–33). Meyer says, on this section: "The Jews themselves bear the guilt of their own exclusion, because they obtained it not by faith, but by works of righteousness, for they were offended at Christ."

[A new chapter should begin here. For, having already stated the objective, Divine ground of the rejection of the Jews, Paul now passes to the subjective or human cause, hinted at frequently before, viz., *their unbelief*. They were rejected by God, because, in spite of the many warnings of their own prophets, they sought their own righteousness, springing from an external view of the law, and were offended at the promised Messiah, when He actually appeared, instead of seeking salvation through vital faith in the grace of God in Christ. This mode of view, which is carried out further in chap. x., solves in part the enigma of the preceding discussion; yet it cannot be denied that, in the Divine predestination, there ever remains an obscure background, which reason is not in a condition to fully comprehend, and should humbly adore.—P. S.]

Ver. 30. **What shall we say then?** [Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; Precisely as in ver. 14, where it introduces an objection.—R.] We may ask, whether the Apostle again uses this expression here in order to avoid a false conclusion, or whether he merely "deduces the historical result from the foregoing prophecies" (Meyer).† Evidently, this passage is a turning-point of the greatest importance. The Apostle has heretofore described God's freedom, and finally His freedom even in rejecting the greater part of Israel in contrast to His call of the Gentiles, and has strengthened his declaration by appealing to the prophecy of the Old Testament. This is now the place where this question arises: From all this, does there not follow fatalism, or a simple absolute authority of Divine freedom? He does not absolutely express this false conclusion, in order to make short work of it by a μὴ γένοιτο, because he has really anticipated it already. But he actually removes it. The Gentiles have not first attained to salvation from an exercise of absolute authority; they have attained to righteousness, the righteousness of faith, which can only be obtained from the source of righteousness.

Some expositors (Pelagius, Cyril, Theodore of Mopsvestia, Flatt, Olshausen) have not understood the expression from ὅτι to ἔφθασε as an answer, but as the real import and continuation of the pending question, under different modifications (ὅτι as *because, that, somehow that*). This is opposed by the following: 1. The statement in vers. 30 and 31 can by no means be regarded as a summary of the foregoing; 2. It has not been at all present as yet in this definite deduction of the antithesis. It contains something new, which only arises as a conclusion from what has preceded. Chrysostom says that this passage is the σαφεστάτη λύσις of the chapter. Baur, and others: The Apostle here first becomes conscious of the *subjective point of view*. Tholuck, correcting this view, says that the Apostle here first brings it out to prominence. On the discussions of the Predestinarians and the Remonstrants concerning the τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν, see Tholuck, p. 546.

That the Gentiles. Ἔθνη; not merely Gentiles. [Against Meyer, who says: "Not *the* Gentiles as a whole. On the *Gentile side* was righteousness," &c.—R.]

Who were not following after righteousness, attained. Τὰ μὴ διώκ. The Apostle uses the διώκειν with especial reference to the races (see Meyer on Phil. iii. 12, 14), and thus καταλαμβ. means not merely the reaching, but also grasping; in this case it is especially the grasping of the prize (see 1 Cor. ix. 24). This constitutes a double antithetical oxymoron. The Gentiles did not run after righteousness, and yet even they grasped righteousness at the goal of the race-course.* But the Jews, who ran, or so far as they were runners after the *law* of righteousness, never reached the proper terminal point of the race—the well-understood law. The Apostle does not design to say that the Gentiles in general had known no higher pursuit; for he has already referred to the Gentiles in his expression concerning preparatory grace: ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν.† But the Gentiles were not only not companions with the Jews in the course in which the latter ran after the law of righteousness; righteousness, as an explicit moral law, was not the fundamental idea of their pursuit (although it constituted the unity of the platonic virtues). The Greek struggled for ideality, or wisdom, while the Roman struggled for an innocent legal order, or for power. Thus it came that they did not run astray by looking at an *analytical phantom* of righteousness, like the majority of the Jews; and hence that they could be subjected (that is, for a preliminary condition of faith) to the curse of their ideals, to a profound despair in themselves and in the glory

since the complete realization of all God's promises will bring what will still all the longing and the thirsting of the human heart from thenceforth and forever."—P. S.]

* [The rescued Israelites are called, Isa. vi. 13 (comp. Ezra ix. 2), "a holy seed," because out of them, as a small beginning, at the same time the nation shall rejuvenate itself, and the true spiritual Israel shall proceed. The Jewish Christians, who escaped the terrible judgment of God upon the mass of the unhappy nation at the destruction of Jerusalem, formed the pith of the Christian Church.—P. S.]

† [Alford answers thus: "This question, when followed by a *question*, implies, of course, a rejection of the thought thus suggested; but when, as here, by an *assertion*, introduces a further unfolding of the argument from what has preceded." What follows is not a question. See below.—R.]

* [It seems best (with Meyer) to consider *righteousness* as used, in this part of our verse, without special reference to the Christian standpoint. Dr. Hodge really advocates this view, but is hampered in reaching it by the limited meaning he places upon the word as used by Paul. Stuart renders δικ., *justification* in each case, which is altogether untenable. See p. 74 ff., &c.—R.]

† [See ver. 23. It is doubtful whether such preparation as is there referred to, includes, in any sense, the *propædeutic* relation of the Gentile world to Christianity, however extensive that relation was.—R.]

of the world see chap. iv.; Acts xvi. 9; Rom. ix. 27–30).*

Even the righteousness which is of faith [Δικαιοσύνην δέ, κ.τ.λ. That is, precisely the true righteousness. On the delicate meaning of δέ, see Alford *in loco;* Winer, p. 412.—R.]

Ver. 31. **But Israel, following after the law of righteousness, attained not to the law** [Ἰσραὴλ δὲ διώκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης, εἰς νόμον οὐκ ἔφθασεν. On the reading, see *Textual Note* [28], and below.—R.] It is not: *the righteousness of the law*, but, more strongly: *the law of righteousness.* This would mean, in the figure of the race, that Israel has by no means advanced so far as to run after righteousness itself; the programme of the race became its goal; in striving after an endless analysis of the law, it has run astray in statutes of external legality. Therefore it has come to pass that it has not reached νόμος in its truth—that is, in its real inward character—and that, after all its running, it has never attained to the true beginning, the principle of the running. This antithesis is in harmony with the subject-matter (see Rom. vii. 7 ff.), and is much stronger than if the Apostle had said: It has not attained to the law of the righteousness of faith, which would be self-evident; or even if he had said: It has not attained to the righteousness of the law according to the letter—which charge he could not bring against them. Therefore we prefer the reading of Codd. A. B. D., given in the text. [The briefer reading is quite well supported, and certainly, when rightly understood, adds to the force of the passage. They did not even attain to the law. Comp. Alford *in loco.*—R.] It hardly needs to be called to mind, that the question here is relatively concerning the Gentiles and Israel; that is, concerning the antithesis between the believing Gentile world and unbelieving Israel. This limitation in reference to Israel lies in the διώκων νόμον.

The law of righteousness. The expression has been regarded by many as an exchange for δικαιοσύνην νόμου (Chrysostom, Calvin, Bengel, and others). Undoubtedly this was the basis of the effort of the Jews, but their real following extended, in Pharisaism, far beyond, to the amplification of the law into an endless series of ordinances. The view: *The justifying law* (Meyer), obscures the strong emphasis of the νόμος itself, when this νόμος is subsequently explained thus: "The law was an ideal, whose realization the Israelites strove to experience by their legalness." Comp. chap. ii. 17–24. *The theoretical, legal orthodoxy* of the Jews was the perfect development of their righteousness of works, according, also, to the Epistle of James.†

Most of the early expositors (Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others) hold that Paul meant the Mosaic law in both cases in ver. 31. Others, on the contrary (Theodore of Mopsvestia, Bengel, and De Wette [Hodge]), have understood, by the second law, the Christian δικαιοσύνη. These two constructions are opposed not only by the διώκων (Meyer: it does not express the effort to *fulfil* the law, but to *possess* the law), but also by the consideration that a true following after the Mosaic law—that is, after its fulfilment—must not only lead to it, but even to Christianity (see chap. vii.). Tholuck (with Calovius, Philippi, and others) takes νόμος in the wider sense, as *via, disciplina* of righteousness: "They strove for the means which furnished justification." But this striving, construed in a general sense, cannot be regarded as fruitless. The law, in the former case, can only mean their illusive image of the law, according to which the law, in its external shape, should become to them a real means of justification, and would in reality be made this means;* but, in the second place, it is the Mosaic law in its truth, and in that inward tendency by which it became the schoolmaster which led them to Christ.

Ver. 32. **Wherefore?** [διὰ τί;] The failure to attain to the law.

Because they sought it not by faith [ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως. The E. V. properly supplies *sought it*]. As the proper observance of the law leads to saving faith, so does it proceed from a germ of faith, which is shown by Abraham's historical precedence of Moses. Faith is the *inward* relation of confidence and obedience to God's Word; only the Spirit in the law gives to the legal striving, which is a preparatory school to the gospel, its proper direction.

But as by works [ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ ἔργων. On ὡς, comp. Winer. p. 573. Alford: "as 'if about to obtain their object' by." See *Textual Note* [29].—R.] Meyer correctly maintains that the ὡς *is not redundant*—as Koppe holds—and that it does not indicate hypocrisy, according to Theophylact; but Meyer is incorrect in opposing Fritzsche's construction, *presumed works*, with this explanation: As a διώκειν proceeding from works is constituted. His ground is, that the Jews really set out from the works of the law, but not simply from *true works* (see chap. x. 3.)† A pointed ἐξ ἔργων must correspond to the pointed ἐκ πίστεως, which former can then be only an ὡς ἐξ ἔργων. In their seeking, they proceeded on the supposition of having one treasure of good works, and they continually piled law upon law, in order to become richer in such works. In short, the starting-point, but not the διώκειν, should be emphasized as fundamentally false.

For they stumbled [προσέκοψαν γάρ. On the rendering, should γάρ be rejected, see *Textual Note* [30]. Meyer, however, opposes this connection, though rejecting γάρ. The figure of a race, if not prominent here, seems at least to have suggested the "stumbling."—R.] To what does *for* refer? First of all, it presents the proof that the Jews did not stand in the direction of faith, but in the illusion of the righteousness of works. Then this proves indirectly, also, the principal statement

* [On this thought, see especially *Griechenthum und Christenthum*, by Dr. G. C. Seibert, 1857, referred to in the General Introd. *Matthew*, p. 6. The author is now a pastor in Newark, N. J.—R.]

† [Dr. Hodge seems to prefer the following view: "The word *law* may be redundant, and Paul may mean to say nothing more than that 'the Jews sought righteousness, or justification, but did not attain it.' This, no doubt, is the substance, though it may not be the precise form of the thought." This is but avoiding an interpretation, and in a way which the learned commentator would deem unjustifiable if applied to less sacred forms than those written by an Apostle.—R.]

* [Alford agrees substantially with this view. In the case of the Jews, "there was a prescribed norm of apparent righteousness, viz., the law, in which rule and way they, as *matter of fact*, followed after it."—R.]

† [The word *as* transfers the matter to the sphere of subjective fancy, and expresses this: that the Jews imagined they were doing the works of the law, but did not really do them, according to the deeper sense and spirit in which the law should be apprehended. Comp. Isa. lviii. 2; Phil. iii. 9.—P. S.]

in vers. 30 and 31. But the full strength of the proof lies in the fact that they have come to shame at the touchstone of the true Israelites, which made a distinction between those who trusted (that is, believers) on the stone laid by Jehovah, and those who stumbled—that is, who were defective in faith because of their presumed righteousness of works.

At that stone of stumbling [τῷ λίθῳ τοῦ προσκόμματος]. (Isa. viii. 14; xxviii. 16; Luke ii. 34; 1 Cor. i. 23; 1 Peter ii. 6–8). The Jews, in their *hypocrisy*, have been offended *first of all* at the *unworldly spirituality*, the *penal office*, the *independence*, and the *spiritual freedom* of Christ (see Matt. iv. 1 ff; John ii. 18; iv. 1; v. 9 ff.), and then, in their claim to the reward of universal Messianic glory, at His poor appearance, His renunciation, His love of sinners, and His suffering and death on the cross. In their running, they ran all the more violently against the stone, because they were just then engaged in their strongest running. The Apostle proves that this fact also is represented beforehand in the Old Testament. He here freely connects the passages in Isa. viii. 14; xxviii. 16, into one prophecy, in which he follows the original text in preference to the LXX. According to Isa. viii. 14, Jehovah himself assuredly *becomes* a stone of stumbling to both houses of Israel; but it is Jehovah who has now concealed His face, in order to declare himself in future to those who patiently wait for Him (see Isa. viii. 17; ix. 7). But that, in chap. xxviii. 16, only the ideal theocracy of the Old Testament sphere is meant, seems very doubtful. The ideal theocracy of the Old Testament is properly defined as the growth of the New Testament kingdom of God. Now, if a corner-stone for this is laid in Zion, it must nevertheless be the foundation of the "ideal theocracy," and not the whole ideal theocracy itself, or even this ideal theocracy apart from its foundation. Likewise, the collective corner-stone in Zion (ver. 16) constitutes a grand antithesis to the Jewish dissolution of God's Word into a ruined diversity (ver. 13), and it stands in connection with the judgment, from which the ὑπόλειμμα appears. Therefore Paul and Peter had a perfect right to regard this passage as more than a typical prophecy.

Ver. 33. [**As it is written, Behold, I lay in Zion a stone of stumbling**, &c. The "stone of stumbling and rock of offence" (σκανδάλου; LXX.: πτώματι) is taken from Isa. viii. 14, and substituted for the "corner-stone," &c., of chap. xxviii. 16. Both passages were interpreted by the Jews as referring to the Messiah. Comp. Luke ii. 34; 1 Peter ii. 6–8. The combination is therefore both justifiable and natural.—**He who believeth on him**, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ. *Πᾶς*, which is found in chap. x. 11, is omitted here (see *Textual Note* [32]). The emphasis there is on πᾶς; here, on πιστεύων, in antithesis to ver. 32.—R.]

Shall not be put to shame, καταισχυνθήσεται. The original word יָחִישׁ [*make haste; Gesenius: flee hastily.*—R.] is here given as an explanation, after the precedence of the Septuagint [καταισχυνθῇ, from which Paul varies, as above].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

[The LITERATURE on the Doctrinal questions involved in this chapter really includes all works on systematic theology, all confessions since the times of the Reformers, together with a large proportion of modern psychological and ethical treatises. The larger commentaries, especially those of Hodge, Stuart, Tholuck, Philippi, Meyer, Haldane, Wordsworth, Jowett, and Forbes, are very full on the predestinarian question. The literature of the Arminian controversy (much of which is enumerated in the *Homiletical Notes* on chap. viii.) bears on this subject. (Comp. lists, *Introd.* p. 51, v. 12–21, p. 191.) We may mention further: AUGUSTINE, *De libero arbitrio*; ANSELM, *De libero arbitrio*; also, *De casu Diaboli*. The works of CALVIN, ARMINIUS, EPISCOPIUS, PRES. EDWARDS, *An Inquiry into the Freedom of the Will* (in numberless editions; necessarian in its conclusions, and more commented upon than any work in this department of thought). COLERIDGE, *Aids to Reflection* (latter part; his views have done much to mould thought in England and America). *The Canons of the Synod of Dort* give the strongest Calvinistic statements. A list of important controversial works is given by Tholuck (pp. 466, 467). The philosophical works which discuss the subject in its ontological aspects cannot be enumerated, but the names of SIR WM. HAMILTON, J. S. MILL, MANSEL, BAIN, TAPPAN, MCCOSH, readily suggest themselves to the American reader. The latest monograph, published in America, is by G. S. BISHOP (Newburgh, N. Y.), *Reprobation* (a sermon on ver. 22), New York, 1869.—R.]

1. In regard to the copious, and, in many respects, mysterious contents of this chapter, we must refer principally to the *Exeg. Notes*, where we have anticipated many points. We would also refer to the history of the exposition of this chapter, and especially to the monographs bearing on the subject, mentioned above. The real difficulties which the chapter presents have been greatly increased by attempts at its exegesis. This has occurred, first, in consequence of the little account that has been taken of the connection, the immediate relation of this chapter to Israel, and the judgment of hardening on Israel; and because there has not been an effort made to explain with sufficient clearness, according to the analogy of Scripture, the nature of the judgment of hardening, or sin in its third potency. A second cause of difficulty has been the confusion of the antitheses of the Apostle with the antitheses of the history of doctrines—of Augustine and Pelagius, or Calvin and the Catholic righteousness of works, or even the doctrine of the Remonstrants. A third source of difficulty has been a failure to use aright the key to this chapter in the passage, chap. viii. 29, 30, and a disposition rather to accept a contradiction between Rom. ix. 7–29 and chaps. ix. 30–xi. 36, than to accommodate the former part of the whole section to the latter.

2. In the division and headings we have already given the connection between the whole of this section and the former chapters. The fundamental thought is, the antithesis of sin and grace in its three potencies.

First antithesis: The actual corruption of the whole world, and therefore no conceivable righteousness of works; in contrast with this is the saving and preponderating righteousness of faith, which is prepared by the *heartiness* of conduct toward the law, in antithesis to external legality (chaps. i. 18–v. 11).

Second antithesis: The corruption of human nature, the hereditary character of liability to sin and of the judgment of death, in which the whole creature-sphere of humanity is subject to vanity and corruption; but Christ as the preponderating principle of the new birth and of the glorification of man, of humanity and its sphere, stands in contrast with the Adamic principle. This principle is operative from the standpoint of a watchful spiritual life, which abnegates the old carnal propensity, in order to lead to resurrection a new embryonic life of consecrated corporealness, in antithesis to the life in the

liability of the flesh to death, to which the external legality also belongs (chap. v. 12–viii. 39).

Third antithesis: The corruption of the religious people, the noble people of humanity, and of the manifested form of their theocracy, in the judgment of historical hardening, in consequence of their false reliance on natural descent, historical privileges, and the righteousness of a practice of legalism. In contrast with this, on the other hand, is the freedom of Divine grace in its election, ordination, and call, which, as election distinguishes persons, as ordination shows mercy and hardens, and as a call makes the judgment of hardening first of all a means for the advancement of the call to salvation, and finally cuts itself short and is turned in another direction by the historical exercise of compassion. On both sides it is conditional, in consequence of the antithesis of pride and humility (chaps. ix–xi.)

3. *The construction of the chapter.* The Apostle's first prologue (vers. 1–5). An *apology* for his painful duty to pronounce clearly the decisive declaration on the rejection of the majority of Israel; or, if we may so speak, to sum up all the individual experiences and Divine judgments relating to this fall. At the same time, he pronounces an *elegy* on the fall of his glorious people of God, on the retributive rejection of the old hereditary people of God, in antithesis to the realization of the glorious inheritance of God's children (chap. viii.), with the declaration of his patriotic and tragical feeling (increased and become to him a "thorn in the flesh" by its ruin with the direction which the Jews had taken, and by the hatred with which they opposed his love)—an analogue to David's *elegy* on the fall of Jonathan, Jeremiah's Lamentations, and similar laments in the Old Testament. But he finally gives expression also to a *doxology* in regard to the victorious exercise of the authority of the God of revelation on Israel, as well in its ancient history as in its New Testament fulfilment in Christ, whose glorification predominates over the division between believing and unbelieving Israel. *The theme:* The rejection of the majority of the members of the Israelitish people is not an abrogation of the promise to the theocratic Israel itself (ver. 6).

First proof (from the time of the patriarchs): The fact of election. The election is not made conditional by descent, nor by heirship, nor by birthright, nor by works; it is God's free *exercise of love* in the predetermination of an individual and personal nature, which is only self-conditioned by the organic relation to Christ and to each other into which the elect individuals shall enter, and by the promise made to them, in which the thought of love, which shall appear in future conceptions and births, is already reflected. It unites in the relative antithesis (Jacob and Esau) the *infinitely great difference* in the qualifications of persons for God's kingdom, but not the *absolute antithesis* of salvation and condemnation (vers. 6–13).—[The doctrine of the predestination of a part of the human race to eternal perdition by no means follows from the statements of these verses. Even Calvin himself calls the decree of reprobation "horrible" (*decretum horribile, attamen verum*), and it is opposed to those passages of the Scriptures according to which God wills not the death of the sinner, but that he might turn unto Him and live. (1.) The Apostle is not treating here at all of *eternal perdition* and *eternal blessedness*, but of a *temporal preference* and *disregard* of nations in the gradual historical development of the plan of redemption, which will finally include all (chap. xi. 25, 32), and hence the descendants of Esau, who stand figuratively for all the Gentiles (Amos ix. 11, 12; Obad. 18–21). On this account we may well say, with Bengel: "not all Israelites are saved, nor all Edomites lost." (2.) The hate of God toward Esau and his race cannot be sundered from their evil life, their obduracy against God and enmity to His people. It is true, ver. 11 (with, however, ver. 13, does not stand so closely connected as ver. 12) seems to represent not only the love of God, but His hatred as transferred even into the mother's womb. But it must not be forgotten that, to the omniscient One, there is no distinction of time, and all the future is to Him present. Besides, an essential distinction must be made between the relation of God to good and evil, to avoid unscriptural error. God loves the good, because He produces the very good that is in them; and He elects them, not *on account of* their faith and their holiness, but *to* faith and holiness. But it cannot be said, on the other hand, that He hates the evil men because He produces the very evil that is in them; for that would be absurd, and destroy His holiness; but He hates them on account of the evil that they do or will do in opposition to His will. While human goodness is the *effect* of Divine love and grace, on the contrary, human wickedness is the *cause* of Divine hatred and abhorrence; and on that account alone can it be the object of the punitive wrath and condemnatory decree of God. Were evil the effect of His own agency, He would be obliged to condemn himself—which is irrational and blasphemous.—P. S.]

Second proof (from the time of the giving of the law): The fact of ordination. The predetermination of the historical train of development of persons is the free exercise of God's (Jehovah's) righteousness on persons. It is not made conditional on a self-volitional human willing and running; but it conditions itself by its consequence in relation to a definite human course of conduct, by further showing mercy on him to whom mercy has once been shown, and allowing all his experiences to contribute to his salvation, and, by its influence and long-suffering, leading him who has once hardened himself to the judgment of hardening. In the infinitely vast antithesis between the one to whom mercy has been shown and the hardened one (Moses and Pharaoh), it constitutes the perspective of the antithesis of a final glorification and rejection, but not yet this antithesis—*i. e.*, the final judgment itself (vers. 14–18).

Third proof (from the time of the development of Israel of the Old Testament):

a. The fact of the call. The free exercise of Divine wisdom on the φύραμα, or the spiritual, plastic material of the ancient world, and especially on Israel. This exercise is not made conditional on the historical Israel's claims to inheritance, and had the right to make of Israel, as it had become, vessels unto honor and unto dishonor, by a universal Christianization. But the call makes itself conditional by the actual state, in which it still endures with much long-suffering the existing vessels of wrath, which are already fitted to destruction, that, by their existence and opposition, the full display of God's glory, of His spiritual revelation in Christ, may be made known on the vessels of mercy. It thereby constitutes the economic antithesis of hardening in the New Testament, and of the historical judicial curse on the great mass of Israel, and of an opposing im

measurable display of the glory of its exercise of mercy in the Gentile world. But this antithesis, as we shall further perceive, does *not* preclude the possibility of mercy on individual Jews, and of the rejection of individual Gentiles (vers. 19–24).

c. The proof of this freedom of the Divine call from the Old Testament. First, the equalization of Jews and Gentiles in their rejection is prophesied by Hosea (ver. 25). Second, the equalization of Gentiles and Jews in the mercy shown to the latter (ver. 26). Likewise, Isaiah has prophesied, first, the reduction of the great mass of Israel to a small remnant, who shall be saved from the judgment (ver. 27); but second, the certainty that such a remnant shall arise from a judgment cut short by righteous mildness (vers. 28, 29).

Fourth proof: The correspondence of the exercise of Divine authority on Jews and Gentiles, with their ethical conduct, or with the antithesis of faith and unbelief. The conclusion from the whole chapter, as drawn by the spirit of the Apostle (vers. 30–33).

[4. This chapter cannot be fairly explained or properly honored without a recognition of the profound truth which lies at the foundation of the doctrine of election, viz., the free, unconditioned grace of God. Those expositors who would limit the sovereignty of the Divine will by human freedom, and deduce salvation more or less from the creature, must do great violence to the text if they make it accord with their systems. Yet we must guard against the opposite extreme of supralapsarianism, which, with fearful logical consistency, makes God the author of the fall of Adam, hence of sin; thus really denying both God's holiness and love and man's accountability, to the ultimate extinguishment of all morality. Many, indeed, have held this view, whose lives, by a happy inconsistency, were far better than their theories. They arrived at this extreme position through a one-sided explanation of this passage, and through the logical consequence of their conception of the sovereignty of God's all-determining will. But if we would not have the Bible prove any thing man wishes, we must interpret single passages in their connection with the whole, and according to the analogy of faith. In the early part of this Epistle (chap. i. 18; iii. 30), Paul unequivocally declares that God is not the author, but the enemy and judge of evil; how, then, can he here affirm a specific Divine foreordination of sin and perdition? In chap. v. 12 ff. he shows that redemption through Christ, as to its indwelling power and purpose, is fully as comprehensive as the fall of Adam. With this agree many passages, which speak of God's sincere will to save *all* men, and of a general call, extended not at once, but gradually, to all (Ezek. xxxiii. 11; 1 Tim. ii. 4; Titus ii. 11; 2 Peter iii. 9). Accordingly, Paul must have in mind here such a general reprobation, as is either a self-incurred result of unbelief, or only a negative preparation for the extension of the plan of salvation, which it therefore ultimately furthers. Besides, in chap. x. the casting away of the Jews is attributed to their own *unbelief*, hence to the personal guilt of the creature; and in chap. xi. the rejection is represented as temporary. In God's gracious decree, the fall of the Jews redounds to the blessing of the Gentiles, and the conversion of the Gentiles ultimately to the salvation of the Jews. So He has permitted the fall of Adam, in order to redeem humanity in Christ, the second Adam (ver. 12 ff.); He has included all under disobedience, that He might have mercy upon all (chap. xi. 32; comp. Gal. iii. 22). But the salvation can become actual only gradually; and the gradual redemption of all (not all as individuals, but the mass in an organic, not a numerical sense) presupposes the temporary rejection of some.

The Scriptures teach, on the one hand, the absolute causality and unconditioned grace of God, and, on the other, the moral nature of man, including also his relative freedom and his responsibility (*i. e.*, human personality). They ascribe redemption and sanctification, as well as the creation and maintenance of all things, to God alone. He works both to will and to do of His good pleasure (Phil. ii. 13); no man cometh to the Son, except the Father draw him (John vi. 37, 44); without the Son, believers can do nothing (John xv. 5). Not only the beginning, but also the progress and completion of conversion, are attributed to God (Jer. xxxi. 18; Heb. xii. 2; Luke xxii. 32; Eph. ii. 10; 1 Cor. iv. 7; 2 Thess. iii. 2; 1 John v. 4). Hence all believers confess, with Paul: "By the grace of God I am what I am" (1 Cor. xv. 10), and ascribe all the honor and glory to the Lord alone (2 Cor. x. 17). Indeed, even evil, as a phenomenon, and according to its material forces, cannot be excluded from the absolute activity of God. He hardens Pharaoh and raises up Nebuchadnezzar; He creates the light and the darkness; He gives peace and effects evil (Isa. xlv. 7); and there is no evil (misfortune) in the city, that the Lord has not done (Amos iii. 6).—On the other hand, however, the Scriptures never treat of man as a mere machine, but as a moral being. They hold up before him, in the Old Testament, laws, with the promise of blessing if he obeys, and the threatening of a curse if he transgresses; they offer him, in the New Testament, the gospel, baptism, faith; bid him, with fear and trembling, work out his own salvation (Phil. ii. 12); present to him the highest moral duties as commands: Be ye holy, be ye perfect; and account sin and the rejection of salvation as his own personal fault. "How often would I have gathered you, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, *and ye would not*" (Matt. xxiii. 27; Luke xiii. 34).*

* [Forbes thus lays down the fundamental truths on this difficult subject:

"All good originates from God.
All evil originates from the creature.

Election originates in the free grace of God.
Reprobation originates in the free-will of man.

To God belongs the whole glory of the salvation of the Elect.
To man belongs the whole responsibility of the ruin of the Reprobate."

See his Dissertation, pp. 380–475.

That these positions are not reconcilable by human logic, is evident from the discussions on the subject; but this cannot, of itself, disprove their truth. It is the old and ever-recurring mystery of the origin of evil. Forbes seeks to prove that these positions are compatible with the doctrinal statements of the Westminster Assembly. Those who wish the sharpest predestinarian views, may find them in Haldane's notes on this chapter. The Synod of Dort, which is considered by many the representative of hyper-Calvinism, only goes thus far in speaking of the reprobates "Whom God, out of His sovereign, most just, irreprehensible and unchangeable good pleasure, hath decreed to leave in the common misery into which they have wilfully plunged themselves, and not to bestow upon them saving faith and the grace of conversion; but permitting them, in His just judgment, to follow their own way, at last for the declaration of His justice, to condemn and punish them forever, not only on account of their unbelief, but also for their

If the first truth respecting the absolute, creative causality of God in the works of creation, redemption, and sanctification be denied, we fall into the Pelagian error, which destroys the very marrow of Christianity, and attributes salvation to the creature; but if the second class of Scripture texts be denied or wrested, we are brought to the brink of the abyss of fatalism or Pantheism; man is degraded into a mere instrument without a will, and his responsibility, guilt, and punishment abrogated. The task of theology consists, not in the establishment of one of these postulates at the expense of the other, but in reconciling both, and bringing into right relations with each other the infinite and finite causality; in loosing, not in cutting the gordian knot. This is, indeed, one of the greatest and most difficult problems, which can never be fully solved from the standpoint of earthly knowledge. Only after the accomplished victory over evil can the deep, dark enigma of evil, which forms the main difficulty in the problem, be fully solved.*

For practical and popular use, the following remarks will suffice:

(1.) There is an eternal predestination of believers unto holiness and blessedness, and hence they must ascribe all the glory of their redemption, from beginning to end, to the unmerited grace of God alone.

(2.) They do not, however, on this account cease to be free agents, responsible for all their doings; but, as God works in nature not magically and immediately, but through natural laws, so He works in men, through their wills, hence through the mediation of finite causes; and the more that grace is developed within them, so much the more is their true freedom developed; so that perfect holiness and perfect freedom coincide with each other. Accordingly, the highest freedom is the complete triumph over the evil, and is consequently identical with the moral necessity of the good. In this sense, God is free just because He is absolutely holy.

(3.) There is no Divine foreordination of sin *as sin*, although He has foreseen it from all eternity, and, with respect to redemption, permitted it, while constantly overruling it to His purposes. Hence, those who are lost are lost through their own fault, and must blame their own unbelief, which rejects the means of salvation proffered them by God.

(4.) In the *time* of the calling of nations and individuals to salvation, God proceeds according to a plan of eternal wisdom and love, which we cannot fathom here, but should adore in silent reverence.

(5.) The right use of the doctrine of election is the humbling of sinners and the comforting of believers, as well as the increase of their gratitude and happiness. Only a culpable misunderstanding and misuse of it can lead to carnal security and to despair.

(6.) Instead of meditating much upon the profound depths of the Divine decrees, it is better for each to make his own calling and election sure, and, with fear and trembling, to work out his own salvation.—P. S.]

5. The forbearance and confidence with which the Apostle pronounces his opinion on the fall of Israel, his patriotic and truly human pain (2 Cor. xii. 7–9), and his prophetic elevation above it, reaching to sublimity, are characteristics of this wonderful man of God.

6. Israel's glory is revealed in the correspondence of its great actual blessings with its chosen individuals. The line of actual saving blessings enters into reciprocal operation with the *personal line* of the fathers down to Christ according to the flesh, the climax in which divinity and humanity unite. Its foundation is Israel's adoption, in Abraham, to sonship. On this there is founded, first, the patriarchal antithesis of the δόξα or of the revealing angel of Jehovah, and of the covenants, in which the evangelical element is properly placed in advance of the legal element, conformably to the character of the patriarchal revealed religion; then comes the antithesis of the Mosaic period, of the gift of the law, and of the services; and here, in conformity with the character of the legal economy, the legal element precedes the evangelical. Both the patriarchal and Mosaic economies then comprise each other, just as the evangelical and legal elements are comprised in the promises of the prophetic period. It has already been remarked that, notwithstanding this articulation, each particular of the attributes mentioned is peculiar in a more general sense to the entire theocracy.

7. Careful attention must be paid to the fact that, in the election in vers. 6–13, the communication of the Divine decree precedes the birth of the children. But, on the other hand, in the ordination in vers. 14–18, it applies to characters already existing —Moses and Pharaoh—in accordance with the direction which they have taken themselves. In the call in vers. 19–24, this communication finally follows the state of the case already existing: Vessels of wrath, vessels of mercy. From the whole of this section, chaps. ix–xi., it follows that the decrees underlying these communications belong also to eternity. But they belong to eternity as decrees which are conditioned upon individual conduct, as God universally conditions himself in the measures which He adopts in reference to persons to be determined or already determined, and their personal relations. The decree of election (or of love) takes cognizance of no other condition than that the single individual must be defined according to the organism of the members of God's kingdom in Christ

other sins. And this is the decree of reprobation which by no means makes God the author of sin (the very thought of which is blasphemy), but declares Him to be an awful, irreprehensible, and righteous judge and avenger" (Canon i., Art. xv.). This is as far as any ought to go, but it is by no means a reconciliation of the two sides of revealed truth, or an attempt at it.—R.]

* [A few *scholia* may be added here: 1. The relation of scientific theology to revealed truth, is that of science in general to the truth it seeks to systematise. Hence theology has unsolved problems, and these furnish the stimulus to further investigation. 2. Theology is not to be considered untrustworthy in its settlement of great questions, because some remain unsolved, nor can the failure of its attempts at solution invalidate either the positions already won, or the separate truths which it has not yet reduced to a system. 3. The modesty of true science has a place in theological discussion. If theologians claim that their attempt at the solution of such a problem as that presented in this chapter is the only one that should be made, the objector may feel that, in successfully opposing that view, he has overthrown the truth itself. 4. This problem is one that is ontological as well as theological, and hence cannot be escaped by rejecting revelation. Atheism avoids it solely by negation, pantheism by opposing the testimony of our own consciousness. Whoever believes in a personal God and his own personality, is confronted with it. The safer position for a child of God to take is that which leaves the difficulty where the greatest glory is ascribed to God. History shows that those who thus acted were not the least concerned to live under the fullest sense of their accountability. The Christian life is thus far the only solution of this great problem; a mystery which is practically reconciled only by one yet greater, the mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh.—R.]

The decree of ordination (or of righteousness) is conditioned by the fact that individuals, in their free self-determination, need, both for themselves and for their relation to the whole body, their historical destination and special guidance. The decree of the call (or of wisdom) is conditioned by the fact that it makes the judgments pronounced on unbelief itself means for subserving the promotion of faith. The distinction of the elder theology, *decretum prædestinationis*, *decretum gratiæ*, *decretum justificationis*, has confused election and ordination — which has generally been the case from Augustine's time down to the present. This distinction has likewise overlooked the fact that the *decretum gratiæ* constitutes the very centre of the *decretum prædestinationis* (Christ ὁ ὡρισμένος, Acts x. 42; Rom. i. 4). The *decretum justificationis* is most intimately connected with the decree respecting the *vocatio*.

8. We have elsewhere brought out the truth, that the wonderful flower of the biblical doctrine of election, like the aloe, has been long *concealed*, yet with its character *determined*, in the sharp thistle of the ecclesiastical doctrine of predestination; and that it is a duty of our day to acquire, with its full idea, the whole depth and glory of the biblical doctrine of personality; but not to seek to weaken and render indifferent, by the old Lutheran or Arminian-Reformed definitions, the solution of an enigma to whose real solution every living distinction of individuals contributes, more than a scholastic hatching of confessional antitheses can do. In this respect, Lavater's Physiognomy may be regarded as an explanatory enlargement upon Calvin and Zwingli. The mystery of predestination, like that of the atonement, and every other Christian mystery, is reflected in the midst of life.

9. Ver. 1. The intimate proximity of salvation and sorrow (chap. viii. 39; ix. 1) in the Apostle's state of mind, as in our Lord's states of mind.

10. Ver. 3. For more particular information on the ban, see Tholuck, p. 472. [See also Excursus on Anathema, p. 302.—R.]

11. The Apostle's patriotism is a tragical feeling, subject to the dominion and kingdom of Christ, and thereby glorified to the intercessory feeling.—On the Shekinah (*doxa*), see the note in Tholuck, p. 477.

12. On the divinity of Christ, and the relevant passages of the New Testament in which He is in part called really God, and in part appears to be so called (John i. 1; xvi. 28; 1 John v. 20; Acts xx. 28; the present passage, ver. 5; Rom. xvi. 27; Eph. v. 5; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Titus ii. 13; 1 Peter iv. 11; 2 Peter iii. 18; Rev. v. 13), comp Tholuck, p. 482. My *Positiv Dogm.*, p. 160 ff.

13. Biblical doxologies: Rom. i. 25; ix. 5; xi. 36; xvi. 27, &c.; 2 Tim. iv. 18; 1 Peter iv. 11; 2 Peter iii. 18, and others.

14. Ver. 6. Not all are Israel which are of Israel. This applies also to every nation, to every confession, to every Christian community, just as it applies in general to the branches of the mystical vine, Christ (John xv. 2).

15. The children of the flesh and the children of promise. See the *Commentary on John*, i. 18. [Comp. *Galatians*, pp. 119, 123.—R.]

16. On the theological discussions with reference to the doctrine of predestination in the present section, see Tholuck, pp. 490-506, and below.

17. Ver. 15. On the idea of consistency in the name of Jehovah, as well in His having compassion as in judging, see the *Exeg. Notes*. It is in harmony with the righteousness of Jehovah's exercise of authority, that even the judgment of death redounds to the life of the sincere and compassionate one; while the gospel, on the other hand, is a savor of death unto death to the perverse and unbelieving. But the consistency of Jehovah does not lie in His carrying out the abstract decrees of His own will, inflexibly and in an exact direction, but in His remaining like himself, and therefore in His even assuming a different position in relation to the changed positions of man; yet this is, of course, in harmony with the consistency of the principles established and realized by Him. Therefore, there is propriety in speaking of a Divine repentance—for example, in the history of the Flood. The position of mankind toward God has become so thoroughly perverted, that the Creator must become the Destroyer. Comp. Ps. xviii. 24-27.

18. On the Egyptians' remembrance of the Pharaoh under whom Israel went forth, see the article *Ægypten*, by Lepsius, in Herzog's *Theol. Encyc.*, and Tholuck, p. 516. On the hardenings of Pharaoh especially, see Exod. iv. 21. Since the judgment of hardness is here declared collectively, the passage does not decide on the succession of the particular ones. The same applies to chap. vii. 3. Then the particular historical ones follow. First, Pharaoh is hardened by the counteraction of the magicians (chap. vii. 13, 22). A significant illustration of the free volition of Pharaoh in the latter case; see chap. vii. 23. In chap. viii. 15 we read: "Pharaoh hardened his heart, and hearkened not unto them." And now his heart becomes hardened, even in spite of the warning of the terrified magicians; chap. viii. 19. Again, in chap. viii. 32: "And Pharaoh hardened his heart." We read the same thing in chap. ix. 7. But in chap. ix. 12 we read: "And the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh." In chap. ix. 34, on the other hand, we again meet with self-hardening, which is then designated as a judgment; ver. 35. In chap. x. 27, the Lord again hardens him. The same occurs in chap. xi. 10; xiv. 8.

As regards this whole series of particulars, the atomistic exegesis of earlier times led to its being regarded as fatalistic. But we must, in the first place, distinguish the prophetical declarations of the judgment of hardening as general views of the whole course of events, from the historical particulars. As for the historical particulars, we must always be very careful to notice that the hardening is not a single act, but a long succession of acts, which succeed momentary shocks and apparent awakenings. But the periods of hardening themselves are divided into three particular acts: 1. Pharaoh is hardened by the magicians; 2. He hardens himself; 3. The Lord hardens him. We must further consider, that he always hardens himself just as soon as he has recovered a little from the penal judgments. But the series of his expressions of penitence must be regarded as arising particularly from fear (*attritio*, not *contritio*). Pharaoh's starting-point is the defiant question Who is the Lord? chap. v. 2. Then he requires a miraculous proof: chap. vii. 7-10. He does not take the first plague to heart, because the magicians do likewise; chap. vii. 22, 23. The first shock and its characteristic expression; chap. viii. 8. Similar emotion; ver. 28. The first confession of sin; chap. ix. 27, 28. The second, chap. x. 16. It is characteristic that Pharaoh pays least attention to

the plagues that least affect him and his house. This may be seen in the first and third plagues; but he observes with more attention, on the other hand, the second and fourth, which rest heavily upon himself. He does not trouble himself about the murrain the boils and blains seem to spare him personally. The thunder and hail, on the contrary, terrify him; the locusts also, but the darkness less. Finally, the death of the first-born at the decisive moment breaks the tyrant's defiance, yet without being able to convert him. And it is out of this wonderful network of human offences and Divine judgments that a ponderous fatalistic decree has been contrived. Meyer quite gratuitously opposes Olshausen's explanation, that the hardening assumes at the outset the already existing beginnings of evil. The ὃν θέλει does not oppose it, for God can let man die before his hardening. Meyer, also, does not favor Calovius' definitions of hardening, that God does not harden man ἐνεργητικῶς, but 1. *συγχωρητικῶς, propter permissionem*; 2. *ἀφορμητικῶς, propter occasionem*; 3. *ἐγκαταλειπτικῶς*; 4. *παραδοτικῶς*.

19. Just as Pharaoh hardened himself more and more at Moses' deeds of faith, so was Moses always advanced and strengthened in faith by the trials of faith which were prepared for him by Pharaoh's hardenings—that is, by the apparent failure of his miraculous deeds. This is a fundamental law of God's kingdom. The kingdom of darkness displays itself in its reciprocal action with the kingdom of light, but the latter is also displayed in its reciprocal action with the former.

20. Tholuck's explanation on having compassion and hardening, p. 523, harmonizes with the old Lutheran dogmatics. Meyer's *resumé*, p. 310.

[Pages 390 ff., 4th edition. Justice to this author, whose clear and acute exegetical notes have been so freely used by Dr. Lange, as well as in the additions, requires the insertion of a larger portion of his theological *resumé* than is given in the original.

"The contents of chap. ix. 9–23, as they have presented themselves purely exegetically, and taken in and of themselves, of course exclude the idea of a decree of God *conditioned* by human, moral spontaneity; for indeed God's *absolute* activity, considered in itself as such, *cannot* depend on that of the individual; but a fatalistic *determinism*, which robs man of his self-determination and free self-positing for salvation, making him the passive object of Divine arbitrariness, must not be deduced from our passage as a Pauline doctrine. For this reason, that this passage is not to be considered separately from what follows (vers. 30 ff.; x. 11), and also because the countless exhortations of the Apostle to believing obedience, to steadfastness and Christian virtue, as well as all his warnings against falling from grace, are so many witnesses against that dreary view which annuls the nature of human morality and responsibility. Should we, with Reiche, Köllner, Fritzsche, and Krehl, suppose that Paul, in his dialectic zeal, had permitted himself to be hurried into *self-contradiction*,* we would have a self-contradiction so manifest, yet so extremely important and dangerous in a religious and ethical aspect, so harshly opposed to the Christian moral ideas of Divine holiness and human freedom, that it were least of all to be expected of *this* Apostle, whose acuteness and dialectic skill *could* guard him against it on the one hand, while especially, on the other, his apostolic illumination and the depth and clearness of his moral experience *must* guard him against it." "But this by no means justifies the interlining of the clear and definite expressions of the Apostle in our passage, on the part of anti-predestinarianism from Origen and Chrysostom until now, to the effect that the moral self-determination and spontaneity of man is the correlative factor to the Divine decree. The correct judgment of the deterministic propositions (vers. 15–23) lies rather between the psychologically and morally impossible admission of a self-contradiction, and the exegetically impossible interpolation in this way, of thoughts the direct opposite of the Apostle's expression. *How* there can be the concurrence, so necessary in the moral world, of the individual freedom and spontaneity of *man* and the absolute self-determination and all-efficiency of *God*, is incomprehensible to human reflection, at least so long as it does not desert the sphere of *Christian* view, and pass into the unscriptural, pantheistic sphere of Identity, in which, indeed, there is no place for freedom in general.* Whenever, of the two truths: 'God is absolutely free and all-efficient,' and 'man has individual freedom, and is also on his side, in his own self-determination as *free agent*, the causer of his salvation or misery,' we handle *but one*, and that one consistently, and hence, one-sidedly, we are compelled to speak *as if the other seems to be invalidated by our reasoning*. But only *seems*; for, in fact, there is in this case only a temporary and conscious abstraction with respect to the other." "Paul, then, found himself in this case. For he wished to present, in opposition to the fancy of the Jews respecting descent and works, the free and absolute almightiness of the Divine will and work, and all the more decidedly and exclusively the less he would leave any ground for the presumptuous error of the Jews, that God *must* be gracious to them. The Apostle has here placed himself entirely on the *absolute* standpoint of the theory of God's pure independence, and that, too, with all the boldness of clear consistency; but only until he has done justice to that polemic purpose. Then he returns (vers. 30 ff.) from that abstraction to the humano-moral standpoint of practice, so that he grants to both modes of view, side by side, that right which they have within the limits of human thought. The view which lies beyond these limits, the metaphysical relation of the essential connection of the two points, viz., objectively Divine and subjectively human freedom and voluntary activity, was necessarily without and beyond his present circuit of view. He would have had no occasion either to enter upon this problem, since it was incumbent upon him to defeat the Jewish presumption with but one side of this—with the absoluteness of God. That, or how far the Divine election is no *delectus militaris*, but finds its norm immanently in God himself through His holiness, and thus may be conditioned by moral conditions on the human side, remains for the present entirely out of the account. It enters, however, with ver. 30, in which the one-sided method of consideration, followed for a time, is again compensated for, and the ground afforded for a time for apolo-

* [Fritzsche, ii. p. 550: "*Melius sibi Paulus consensisset, si Aristotelis, non Gamalielis alumnus fuisset*" ( )—R.]

* [Still less in modern materialism, where what is (probably from habit) called *free* civilization is attributed mainly to climate and food, especially fish Compare current literature *ad nauseam*.—R.]

getic purposes, to the doctrine of absolute decrees, is again withdrawn."—R.]

He opposes those who have charged the Apostle with a self-contradiction—determination and freedom (Reiche, Köllner, Fritzsche, &c.); but he himself thinks that the metaphysical relation of unity between the all-prevailing efficiency of God and man's freedom is incomprehensible by Christian reflection, and that, therefore, we can only speak of the one, considered in itself alone, in such a way that the other seems to be removed by our reasoning. But this is not the case if we speak either of human freedom or of God's free grace in a proper way. The former assumes dependence on God; the latter requires faith. Though God's all-efficiency is not conditional on man, yet it conditions itself as the personal exercise of authority in relation to man, so soon as he is determined by election, according to the stage of development in which man is. It may also be said that the one decree of God is explained, according to chap. viii. 29, 30, in five decrees, and these are reciprocally conditional.

If the decree of election were an absolute determination of salvation and condemnation, there would be no peculiar decree of ordination or historical predetermination; God would no more be free to say to Moses, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy." But if the decree of ordination were absolute, then we could no more speak seriously of a new decree of the call, and still less of a free idea of *justification*, as well as of *glorification*. The Divine decree in relation to the final judgment has conditioned itself by the nature of all the preceding decrees. And only in this way does God remain a free God, while, on the other hand, we would make of an unconditional decree of predestination itself a real divinity, which would have bound the personal God. But it is quite in harmony with the nature of religion, the real relation between God and man, that the truth asserts the majesty of the Divine right against every human arrogation, every irreligious claim against God. The free power of election stands in opposition to the claim of a natural heirship in God's kingdom; the free power of grace, in its historical exercise of authority, opposes the claim to the merit of works; and the free power of the Divine call in the economic relations of God's kingdom opposes the claim to both. If the point is reached where man will make God conformable to himself, before whom he would present himself independently, yea, one whom he thinks that he can bind by "replying against" him, then God himself opposes him in His truth as the God who stands in absolute free power above him, and before whom he is as nothing, or as the clay in the potter's hand. Up to this point the Apostle must have recourse to the Jewish assumptions against God's majesty. The pioneers of the Reformation, but particularly the Reformers themselves, were in a similar situation; ecclesiastical tradition had, in the latter case, taken the place of descent from Abraham; ecclesiastical righteousness of works had taken the place of Levitical righteousness of works; the self-righteous creature began to prescribe laws for his Creator. The Reformers, adhering to the truth, thus reversed the relation: God's sovereignty and grace are every thing, while the arrogated right and merit of man are nothing. But their arriving in theory—which was really only one chapter in their system—to the negation of human freedom of election (Melanchthon, in his later life, excepted), and their being led into contradiction with their ethical principles, were in part a tribute of weakness which they had to pay to their independence from the Catholic Augustine (strong expressions of Calvin and Zwingli, see Tholuck, p. 528), and in part the false conclusion from a profoundly justified religious feeling. They taught, with good ground, that God's government of the world is a government controlling and pervading all moral events, and that even sin is not merely permitted, but accepted and determined as a fact in God's plan; only they had not yet found—as Sebastian Frank, at their time, and, subsequently, such orthodox teachers in the Church as Breitinger, Vœtius, and others—the distinction between sin as a wicked counsel of the heart, that merely appertains to man, and sin as a fact in which inward sin itself is already treated with irony, captured, and judged (see Prov. xvi. 1 ff.). The Apostle himself, on the contrary, has united the doctrine of the absolute judicial power of God with the doctrine of the importance of faith, yet particularly with the declaration that God has delayed His historical judgment in long-suffering, and has made the already existing judgment of hardness a medium of compassion.*—"The people, clay in the potter's hand," is a frequently recurring biblical expression. See Tholuck, p. 530; also the Note on p. 532; likewise p. 536.

21. The concatenation of judgment and compassion which appears throughout in the facts of Holy Scripture, as well as in its doctrines, has not been sufficiently comprehended and made use of by the popular ecclesiastical conception; and this is a principal source of its hindrances and imperfections Righteousness and mercy are regarded as collateral modes of God's revelation. Judgment and compassion absolutely preclude each other. But the Scriptures unite both facts in various ways.

First, the reconciliation of men themselves, both collectively and individually, inwardly as well as outwardly, is made conditional on a judgment which separates the old from the new life. Second, the display of redemption and its institutions, of the theocracy and of the Church, is conditioned by judicial acts that separate the old from the new states. Third, judgment, even from the flood downward, separates an old from a new race, and brings to pass the redemption of the latter by the still conditional rejection of the former. Even in the final judgment, the consummation of heaven is made conditional on the separation of the wicked; Matt. xiii. 43.

22. With the confusion mentioned above, there is also connected the fact that righteousness has ever been too much regarded as the extreme consequence of rigor, but not also in the light of forbearance and mildness. This latter idea of righteousness is frequently taught in the Scriptures (see Matt. i. 19; 1 John i. 9), and so also in the present chapter, ver. 28. Comp. also chap. iii. 26, p. 135.

23. The full and direct force of the passage in ver. 31 is only reached by accepting the reading preferred by us. The Jew's righteousness of works, as such, was never faithful righteousness of works, but a righteousness of boasting of the practice of statutes, and therefore it was a failure to obey the true

* [A reference to the *Exeg. Notes* will show how Dr. Lange finds this mitigating idea of long-suffering throughout the chapter. Admitting the correctness of his exegesis (which many will not be prepared to do), it is still doubtful, whether his explanation of the enigmatical question in hand is any more satisfactory than that of Meyer.—R.]

νόμος itself. In a similar sense, James portrays the orthodoxy of the Jews (see the Commentary *in loco*). This is also the case with the ecclesiastical righteousness of works in the Middle Ages; its weight does not lie in fidelity to the law, but in the fanatical zeal to explain and sharpen the statutes to excess. And so the orthodoxy of the seventeenth century was not strictness of confessional fidelity, but zeal for the statutory amplification and sharpening of confessional formulas. Centrifugal deviations from the collective fundamental thought and original fountain everywhere prevailed.

24. Israel, in its guilty and accursed destiny, is also a type of the richly deserved curses in the political as well as in the ecclesiastical life of nations.

25. Chaps. x. and xi. are an enlargement upon chap. ix.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

CHAP. IX. 1-5.

[HOMILETICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY ON ROM. ix. 3: WEEMSE, J., *Of the Highest Degree of Love to God; An Exposition*, &c., vol. i. 48; LIGHTFOOT, J., *St. Paul's Wish to be Accursed. Works*, vol. vii. 312; GELL, R., *Remains*, 2; WITSIUS, H., *De votivo anathemate Pauli; Miscellanea*, vol. ii. 41; WATERLAND, D., *St. Paul's Wish Explained and Illustrated, Sermons, Works*, vol. ix. 252; DODWELL, W., *The Importance of the Christian Faith, Illustrated in the Explanation of St. Paul's Wish of being Accursed for his Brethren*, Oxford, 1752; KEELING, B., *Three Discourses on St. Paul's Wish*, &c., Oxford, 1766; MASON, W., *Christian Patriotism, Works*, vol. iv. 105; TOPLADY, A. M., *Thoughts*, &c., *Works*, vol. iii. 418; RECONSIDERED TEXTS, No. I., J. C. Knight, Kitto's *Journal*, 1st series; Nos. 10-12. Two Letters, by A. Davidson and J. C. Knight, on the above interpretation. *Ibid.* —J. F. H.]

The Apostle's sorrow for his brethren: 1. A great sorrow, so that he wished to be accursed from Christ for them; 2. A natural sorrow, because they (*a.*) are his kinsmen according to the flesh; (*b.*) are Israelites to whom pertaineth the adoption, &c. (vers. 1-5).

An apostolical asseveration (ver. 1).—Words only have strength when our conscience bears us witness in the Holy Ghost that we say the truth in Christ (ver. 1).—The witness of our conscience in the Holy Ghost is a witness for us that we say the truth in Christ (ver. 1).—Magnanimous heaviness and magnanimous pain (ver. 2).—The Apostle's readiness to stake the dearest possession for his brethren (ver. 3).—The difference between Israelites and Jews (ver. 4).—What do Israelites possess? 1. The whole of the Old Testament, with all its covenant blessings; 2. The fathers; 3. Through the fathers, Christ, so far as His human descent is concerned, belongs chiefly to them (John iv. 22) (vers. 3-5).

STARKE, CRAMER: In important matters for God's honor and the advancement of our neighbors' salvation, we may swear (Isa. xix. 18; Jer. xii. 6); but to wantonly affirm a thing before God, is an abuse of God's name (Exod. xx. 7) (ver. 1).—The saints are not stoical blocks of wood (!); therefore we should also weep with those that weep, and rejoice with those that rejoice (ver. 2).—Love has certain degrees, and one may with a good conscience prefer in love his natural friends and blood relations to others (ver. 3).—*Nova Bibl. Tüb.*: Nothing grieves pious people more than the ruin of the ungodly. Particularly a true shepherd can do nothing else than speak of them with sorrow and tears (ver. 2).—HEDINGER: This is love! Oh, that we had even a less degree of it! Exod. xxxii. 32.

GERLACH: Calvin beautifully says: "It is not contradictory to this wish of the Apostle, that he knew of a surety that his salvation by God's election could not prove a delusion. For as such a glowing love always burns out more violently, so does it see nothing and care for nothing except its object" (vers. 1-5).

LISCO: The Apostle's sorrow at Israel's unbelief (vers. 1-5).—In Christ every thing was glorified and fulfilled which Israel already had; how important, therefore, it was to believe in Him whom the antitypes had announced, and who brought grace and truth! John i. 16, 17.

HEUBNER: Asseveration of the Apostle's love for his people (vers. 1-5).—It is only a spirit sanctified by God's grace that can be grieved at the spiritual fall of others. The unconverted man is indifferent to the moral misery of his neighbor. The holiest sorrow is for others (ver. 2).

BESSER: Throughout the Holy Scriptures there is not another passage where, as in the present instance, the most profound darkness of sorrow is in juxtaposition with the brightest sun of joy. Paul has ascended on the wings of faith to the height where he sees the whole kingdom of the world and the devil lying at his feet; and, sheltered in the rock-strong love of God in Jesus Christ, he has sung a triumphal song in the upper choir. There he pauses, and as one who is still dwelling in the land of pains and tears, just at this point he discloses to his brethren, first, the profound and concealed sorrow of his life by a solemn assurance of that of which he would have God also conscious (ver. 1).—The sainted BENGEL says: "Souls which have made no progress, do not comprehend Paul's wish. We should not lightly pronounce judgment upon the measure of love in Moses and Paul. The modicum of our thoughts of love is too small for us to do so; just as a boy does not appreciate the heroic spirit of a general" (ver. 3).—Not *Jacobites*, but *Israelites*, wrestlers with God, are called the descendants of the patriarch, who obtained of the Lord a blessing upon his seed, that they might be called after his name, and the names of his fathers Abraham and Isaac (ver. 4).—Eight blessings of God's house united in four pairs (vers. 4, 5).

[BURKITT: God has placed a conscience in every man, whose office it is to bear witness of all his words and actions; yea, of all his thoughts and inward affections. Conscience is God's register, to record whatever we think, speak, or act; and happy is he whose conscience bears witness for him, and doth not testify against him.—Ver. 2. Note: 1. What are the dismal effects and dreadful consequences of obstinate unbelief, under the offers of Christ tendered to persons in and by the dispensation of the gospel, without timely repentance? 2. The true spirit of Christianity is to make men mourn for the sins and calamities of others in a very sensible and affectionate manner. Good men ever have been and are men of tender and compassionate disposition; a stoical apathy, an indolence of heart, a want of natural affection, is so far from being a virtue, or matter of just commendation unto any man, that the deepest sorrow and heaviness of soul in some cases well becomes persons of the greatest piety and wisdom; 3. Great sorrow and continual heaviness of heart for the miseries of others, whether imminent or incumbent, but especially for the sins of others, is an undoubted argument, sign, and evidence of a strong and vehement love toward them—

HENRY: We ought to be in a special manner concerned for the spiritual good of our relations, our brethren and kinsmen. To them we lie under special obligations; and we have more opportunity of doing good to them; and we must, in a special manner, give account concerning them, and our usefulness to them.—HODGE: Fidelity does not require that we should make the truth as offensive as possible. On the contrary, we are bound to endeavor, as Paul did, to allay all opposing or inimical feelings in the minds of those whom we address, and to allow the truth, unimpeded by the exhibition of any thing offensive on our part, to do its work upon the heart and conscience.—J. F. H.]

[SCHAFF: Vers. 4, 5. These advantages of Israel, sketched by the Apostle, are at once types and prophecies of the higher blessings, which continue uninterruptedly in the Christian Church, and are enjoyed daily and hourly by all believers. In their lap is the adoption and heirship of eternal life, the continued presence of the Lord in the means of grace, the eternal covenant of grace instead of the successive covenants, the free, life-giving spirit, instead of the killing letter of the law, the worship in spirit and in truth in all places instead of the service confined to Jerusalem, the far more plain and precious promises of the heavenly Canaan and amaranthine inheritance, the incomputable cloud of witnesses, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, and confessors, from all climes and tongues, and, as the sum of all blessings, Jesus Christ, the God-man and Saviour, who is flesh of our flesh, aye, our Brother and Friend, and yet exalted above all, the eternally adored Head of the Church, which He calls "His body, the fulness of Him who filleth all in all."—R.]

VERS. 6-33.

a. Vers. 6-13. Who are the true Israelites? 1. By no means all who are of Israel, or are the seed of Abraham, are children according to the flesh; but rather, 2. The children of promise, whom He has freely chosen according to His purpose (vers. 6-13).—The question of Divine adoption does not depend upon natural descent, but upon the mercy of the call, without the merit of works (vers. 6-13).—God's word (promise) has not failed because many are not Israelites—that is, are not participators in the promise (vers. 6-8).—Neither has God's word failed to us because many who are called evangelical are not evangelical (vers. 6-8).—How Paul, the Apostle of the righteousness of faith, reminds us of John the Baptist, the preacher of repentance! Comp. vers. 6-8 with Matt. iii. 9.—The children of the promise: 1. Isaac, the son of Abraham; 2. Jacob-Israel, the son of Rebecca (vers. 9, 10).—The mystery of election and reprobation (vers. 10-14).—Not by the merit of works, but by the mercy of Him who calleth! A passage: 1. For our humiliation; but also, 2. For our consolation (ver. 12).

STARKE: God does not look at carnal service and external advantages and privileges in the distribution of His mercy and spiritual blessings; 1 Cor. xv. 10 (ver. 12).—HEDINGER: God's word always has its fulfilment in either one way or the other; Jer. xxxii. 42 (ver. 6).—Beware of founding your hope of salvation on birth, or the visible Church, or merely seeming work. One must inwardly be a Christian and Abraham's heir (ver. 7).

SPENER: By this instance (vers. 8, 9) Paul has sufficiently shown that salvation does not depend on natural birth, and that, therefore, not all the descendants of Israel were necessarily the people of the covenant. But because it might have been said that Ishmael was born of the bondwoman, and lost such an honor in consequence of his wicked life, for he was a scoffer, Paul proceeds to show, by the example of Esau and Jacob, that it depended upon God's free choice as to whom He would show certain spiritual or temporal advantages and benefits, in which case He does not look at works (vers. 10-13).

ROOS: The children of the promise are such as have become the children and true seed of Abraham by belief in God's promise (vers. 8-11).—An election does not preclude the foreknowledge of faith and works, but, on the contrary, it always goes in advance, while faith and good works follow afterward. Thus, a soldier is chosen before he has furnished a proof of his bravery; a child is chosen for adoption before he has given evidence of filial gratitude. The exhibition of bravery and gratitude is hoped for. But what is man's hope, is God's foreknowledge. Yet it must not be said that, in making an election, the one who chooses has been influenced by works that have already occurred. It was not from works already performed by Jacob that God's promises resulted, but from the loving will of God, who stands in need of nothing, whom no creature can place under obligation, and who does not inwardly pass from hatred to love (vers. 11-13).

GERLACH: As the preference of Jacob to Esau, and of the Israelites to the Edomites, was declared by God before the birth of the two ancestors, and thus what Jacob had in advance could by no means depend upon any privilege or merit of birth, so is free grace the bestowal of justification through Christ; it does not depend upon anticipated virtues or services of him who receives them; it admits valid claims of any kind (vers. 11-13).

LISCO: The Apostle's purpose is to prove that God, far from all arbitrary authority, and with the most exalted love, holiness, and wisdom, though without binding himself to natural laws (primogeniture, posterity of Abraham), or to the narrow limits of a certain descent, proceeds in His guidance of nations, and now calls this one and now that one to the gospel, just as He formerly called to a share in the privileges of the old covenant people. The Israelite, as such, had legal claims to salvation in Christ, yet not on account of his natural descent, as is shown from both the examples adduced. Even Esau's descendants, and, indeed, all heathen, have been called to salvation in Christ; therefore evidently Esau's rejection is by no means regarded as eternal, and the object of Jacob's preference is the temporary salvation of the nations descended from both Esau and Jacob (vers. 11-13).

HEUBNER: We must maintain: 1. Paul's speech is altogether individual or national, and applies solely to Israel, in order to prostrate Israel's perverse pride; 2. The question is not concerning an eternal election and reprobation, but the calling of a people by the external call, by revelation, and concerning the subsequent rejection of such a call (vers. 6-13)

b. Vers. 14-18. Is God unrighteous? This objection is refuted by Paul: 1. By reference to God's declaration to Moses; 2. By reference to such a declaration to Pharaoh (vers. 14-18).—Moses and Pharaoh: 1. Moses, an example of God's mercy and compassion; 2. Pharaoh, an example of hardening; 3. Both together are examples of God's free elec-

tion (vers. 14–18).—On what does our salvation depend? 1. Not upon our willing or running; 2. But upon God's mercy (ver. 16).

STARKE: God is and ever remains righteous, however He disposes things according to His sovereign will and good pleasure (ver. 14).—Oh, the great and exceeding riches of divine mercy and compassion, by which God performs all the good which He bestows on man, without regard to any service, greatness, honor, or appearance! (ver. 15.)—HEDINGER: One's own running, working, exerting himself, devising services, doing penitence, and inflicting scourging crawling into caves and putting on sackcloth, accomplish nothing; God must open the heart, and, when He knocks, open to Him! He has the key himself, and you have from Him the hands and the power to throw wide open for His entrance (ver. 16).—Hardening is a great judgment. Many are involved in it, and yet they do not know it (ver. 17).—SPENER: Thus God's will is perfectly free and unconfined in its own work, and He has the power to show mercy or not, just as He will, without our ability to find sufficient cause for the difference, although He himself, as the wise and holy God, does nothing without a holy cause, so that even His freest power wills and does in such a way as His wisdom perceives conducive to His glory. For as men of understanding do not foolishly and thoughtlessly use their freedom, but do every thing considerately and with a rational choice, even when they are in the enjoyment of the most unfettered freedom, how should we suppose that the all-wise God can have mercy and harden without holy causes, or in any other way than is in harmony with His goodness, righteousness, and majesty, though above our understanding? This should be enough for us: The holy and righteous God, who never can wish to do any thing evil, wills it to be thus.

ROOS: Ver. 16: Moses desired to see God's glory; but his desire would not have obtained this view by force. More than once Moses ascended to the top of Sinai, and came down again; but his running did not earn as a reward that which he prayed for. God met his willing by compassion: out of compassion He crowned Moses' ascent of Mount Sinai by an extraordinary blessing.—GERLACH: Ver. 16: Paul elsewhere exhorts (1 Cor. ix. 24–27; Phil. iii. 12–14) in the most decided way to will and to run; but it is a willing whose soul is God's mercy toward sinners, and it is a running whose power is God's renewing grace.

LISCO: The last and only *ground* of participation in God's kingdom is and ever remains God's mercy (ver. 16).—All of Pharaoh's efforts did not prevent the execution of the Divine purposes, but he himself became, contrary to his will, an instrument for their execution; accordingly, God was glorified in the perverse king, who did not escape His righteous punishment (ver. 17).—Thus, then, God shows His *mercy* on whomsoever He will with unlimited freedom; and He hardens whomsoever He will—that is, He allows His mercy to redound to the ruin of those who, like Pharaoh, are impervious to all of His instructions and guidance; and thus it can also come to pass to the unbelieving Jews, that God will withdraw His mercy from them if they scorn His gospel, just as Pharaoh once despised God's will (ver. 18).

HEUBNER: No people can prove that it will be God's people (ver. 16).—The humiliation of presumptuous tyrants is a glorification of God (ver. 17).—Hardening is therefore never a blindly absolute, but always a righteous decree of God on those who have long withstood all of His calls. Pharaoh would not have been hardened, if his many cruelties had not already hardened his heart (ver. 18).

BESSER: To sum up, says Luther (*Works*, vol. xxii. p. 745): "Every thing is spoken against the proud. 'He to whom I give shall have it, and you shall not take it from me by your holiness.' What more shall he do? He nevertheless says, 'You shall have it, but if you seek and wish to have it for the sake of your righteousness and your piety, I cannot and will not allow you to have it; I will sooner tear to pieces and destroy every thing, both priesthood and kingdom, and even my own law. But show me mercy, and you shall have it'" (ver. 16).—He who can still take upon himself to say, "God has had compassion on me *because* I am not as Pharaoh was," has not yet read the Epistle to the Romans aright. The reverse is the case: *Because* God has had compassion on me, I am not as Pharaoh, but as Moses (ver. 18).

c. Vers. 19–29. Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? 1. Remember that thou art only the work, but He is the Maker; 2. Therefore submit unconditionally to His sovereign will (vers. 19–21).—What does God design by His unconditional and free election? 1. On one hand, to show His wrath and make known His power; 2. But, on the other, to make known all the more, by this means, the riches of His glory (vers. 22–29).—The vessels of wrath and the vessels of mercy (vers. 22–24).—Who are the vessels of mercy? All who are called; not alone, 1. of the Jews, but, 2. also of the Gentiles (ver. 24).—Hosea and Isaiah as witnesses of God's grace, showing mercy on and calling Jews and Gentiles: 1. Hosea; 2. Isaiah (vers. 25–29).

LUTHER: Although the greater part fall away and remain unbelieving, He will nevertheless not *let all fall*, but will support the rest, and by them all the more abundantly disseminate His word and grace, in order that they may be righteous and glorious (ver. 28).

STARKE: God, in leading man to salvation, does not deal with him according to the unconditional purpose of His will and with unlimited power, but in a certain order, in which they who are ennobled by the rational soul have obtained the freedom to obey or to oppose (ver. 29).—Also teachers and preachers must exhibit an appropriate gentleness when censuring the ungodly, and must not always select the rarest words of abuse and reproach, to pour them out upon them like a heavy shower (ver. 26).—Do not despair, though you be miserable; the merciful and gracious Lord can cause a light to arise within you; Ps. cxii. 4 (ver. 25).—HEDINGER: God be praised for His long-suffering! How many thousand brands of hell dost thou bear with! Thou art, and ever remainest, my righteous God! Ps. ciii. 8 (ver. 22).—LANGE: If you would be a true vessel of mercy, you must draw grace for grace from the fulness of Jesus (John i. 16).—Let the love of God be poured out in your heart by the Holy Spirit (chap. v. 5); and in order that you may be useful in the Lord's house, and a vessel sanctified to His honor, seek to be purified from contact with all impure vessels (ver. 23).

SPENER: The Apostle says of the vessels of mercy, that God *has prepared* them for glory. He is not only their Creator, but *their being the vessels o*

His mercy is His own preparation. But he does not say of the vessels of wrath, that God *prepared* them for destruction, but that they *are fitted to destruction* who have fitted and corrupted themselves to it, so that their condemnation does not come from God, but only that He has long borne with them patiently, just as He did to Pharaoh, and that He finally destroys them with all the more violence. By this are declared His glory, power, compassion, and righteousness, without one coming in conflict with the other (vers. 22, 23).—ROOS: The great long-suffering of which Paul speaks, proves that God takes no pleasure in the destruction of the vessels of wrath; for if He had wished, He could at any time have given them up to destruction sooner than He really did; but the efficacious call, which applies to the vessels of mercy both of the Jews and Gentiles, proves that God does not indulge a preconceived hatred either of the Jewish people or of the Gentile nations, and it is only His call that makes a difference between the vessels of wrath and of mercy (vers. 22-24).—GERLACH: We must always bear in mind, that when God has compassion, and when He hardens, He acts in different ways; in the former case, He produces good in the human heart by His compassion; and in the second, He withdraws from man His divine light and life, yet does not awaken evil in him, but only allows the evil already existing to assume the form and take the course which, to Him, is evidently necessary for the salvation of the world. Man's seeing, in mercy as well as in hardening, a perfectly similar operation of God—namely, His own arbitrary authority—is his own fault, since he closes himself against God's compassionate love by his own claims (ver. 21).

LISCO: All humanity, and not merely Israel (which fancied itself thus), is like the clay from which God, of His own free choice, chooses unto participation in the kingdom of heaven; and He is not bound to Israel in such a way that He cannot also appoint the Gentiles to the same privilege (vers. 20, 21).

HEUBNER: Before God rejects a people, He patiently gives it time for repentance (vers. 19-23).—Especially on ver. 19: The universal objection of all determinists, fatalists, and absolutists, is: "How can man be free, since in his existence, and in the formation and change of his mind, he is totally dependent on God?" This is here represented in a special direction, thus: "How can sin be imputed to man? Why does God's punishment of him enrage him? He is only what God makes him! Who can oppose God?" This objection is still frequently heard in such modifications as these: "Man becomes every thing, just according as he is trained, educated, and placed in a favorable or unfavorable state?" We may answer this objection somewhat as follows: Although man does not himself control his destiny, and although this destiny has an influence upon his development, yet it is by no means compulsory; the external world does not operate irresistibly upon him. —Yet Paul does not exactly answer thus, but says, ver. 26: "*Yea, dear man,*" &c.—Ver. 21: This comparison would be inaptly applied if it were regarded as an irresistible formation of character: "Can God not make out of *this* man a bad one, and out of *that* a good one?" The question is only the determination of the external state which operates on man. "Cannot God, according to His own will, direct to every one his condition and all the circumstances that operate upon him?" It still depends on man whether he will make use of his condition in this or that way, and in what shape he will allow himself to be be formed. Comp. 2 Tim. ii. 20, 21. In Jer. xviii. 6, the type of the potter applies to the events that God allows a people to experience, but not to the determination of their salvation or destruction.

d. Vers. 30-33. The faith of the Gentiles, and the unbelief of the Jews: 1. The establishment of this fact; 2. The explanation of its origin (vers. 30-33).—In the righteousness of faith, the law of righteousness is really fulfilled (vers. 30, 31).—Who attains to the law of righteousness? All who seek its fulfilment, not: 1. By the works of the law, but, 2. By faith (vers. 31, 32).—The stumbling-stone: 1. For some a rock of offence; 2. For others a rock of salvation (ver. 33). Comp. 1 Peter ii. 4-10.

LUTHER: Christ justifies without works; they who do not believe Him, run against Him and stumble (ver. 32)

STARKE: O thou tempted soul, who art ever indulging in fearful thoughts, thou shalt certainly not be ashamed! (ver. 33.)—CRAMER: If one should seek fire in snow, or ice in fire, he would not find it so he who seeks life, righteousnesss, and salvation in the law, and not in Christ, will never receive them (ver. 32).

SPENER: God laid such a stone in Zion as would of itself be a stone of help, a tried and precious corner-stone, on which the fallen could and should rise. But man's wickedness, &c., causes many to stumble against it, and their fall is more dangerous than if such a stone had not been placed there Yet God's saving counsel must not be in vain for all, for there are others, on the other hand, who hold to this rock, and believe on it. These will not be deceived in their hope, nor come to shame, as they will take from it that which they have hoped for—salvation (ver. 33).

ROOS: As Paul had previously made every thing dependent on simple grace and mercy, and on God's free will, so he now makes every thing dependent on faith. Grace and faith, the will of God and faith, correspond to or meet each other. Grace is in God, faith is in man (vers. 30-33).—GERLACH: God did not enforce His right against the unbelieving Israelites, nor harden their hearts, nor fit them for destruction, because He predestinated them for destruction before their existence, but because they "replied against God" (vers. 18-22).

LISCO: The *reason* why Israel refuses to accept the gospel, and is rejected, is because they seek it—righteousness—before God, *not of faith*, but by doing the works prescribed in the law; and therefore they experience the judgment of falling against the stumbling-stone (ver. 32).

HEUBNER: No people or no man is so corrupt that God cannot call and save if they will only believe in the gospel, and become sensible of their guilt (ver. 30).—All the works on which man relies cannot save him, but rather hinder him (Luke xii. 24). Therefore the paradox: It would be better for many if they were worse (ver. 32).—Offence at Christ is culpable; it is one that is taken, and not given (ver. 33).

BESSER: Luther (*Works*, vol. vii. p. 321) strikingly compares the law to the field in which Christ, the Treasure, is buried. The Jews had the field, and even tilled it with great pains, but they did not see the buried treasure; but the Gentiles, on the contrary, since they found Christ in the law, went

for joy beyond the law, and sold every thing which they had, and bought the field with its treasure—that is, the law with Christ (vers. 30, 31).

LANGE: The forbearance and decision with which the Apostle expresses the strict judgment on Israel, is an example for us, when occasion occurs, to speak unpleasant truths.—The Apostle's fidelity to the Israelites is conditioned by his fidelity to the Lord; or the duty and limits of patriotism.—Israel's fall is an eternal admonition for churches, states, and nations.—The greater the glory of a community, the deeper is its fall.—Israel, which was once saved, is now judged in Christ its Head.—God's freedom with respect to humanity: 1. How it is bound by institutions and promises; 2 Yet how it also remains free.—His freedom in His determinations: 1. In the determination of the personalities themselves; 2. Of their fate, and its effect; 3. Of their call to the kingdom.—The freedom and consistency of Divine sovereignty in the name Jehovah.—The antitheses: Israel and Isaac, Jacob and Esau, Moses and Pharaoh. The judgment of hardening elucidated by Pharaoh's history.—Judgments changed by the sovereignty of God himself to the glorification of His mercy.—God's judgments are cut short by His wisdom and grace.—The importance of faith in antithesis to ordinances.—The twofold operation of the corner-stone.

[LIGHTFOOT: Ver. 3. We owe charity to every one because of his soul. If a soul, in its essential constitution, be not beautiful and lovely, what thing upon earth can be accounted beautiful and lovely? A soul that carries the image of God in its very constitution—that is like to the nature of angels in its essence and being—that is capable of divine nature and of eternal life and glory—if this be not lovely, what is? It is a great piece of wisdom to study souls, and to observe the nature, worth, price, and excellency, both of our own and other men's; and there is not a more general and comprehensive cause of the ruin of souls, than men's ignorance of and unacquaintance with their own souls. Shall I hate any man's soul? It may be united to God. Hate any man's body? It may be a temple of the Holy Ghost. Any man's person? He may be an inheritor of eternal glory. Scorn not poor Joseph; for all his rags and imprisonment, he may come to sit upon a throne. Despise not poor Lazarus; for all his sores and tatters, he may be carried by angels into Abraham's bosom.—BURKITT: Learn: 1. What the sincere believer shall not be ashamed of: *a.* He shall never be ashamed of his choice; *b.* Nor of his profession; *c.* Nor of the cause and interest of Christ, which He has owned and vindicated in the world; *d.* Nor of any time sincerely spent in the work and service of Christ; *e.* Nor of reproaches and sufferings, tribulations and persecutions, for the sake of Christ; *f.* Nor in eternity, that he never was ashamed here of Christ and His gospel, His work and service, His cause and interest. 2. When the believer shall not be ashamed: *a.* When he is called to bear testimony of Christ before the world, at the hour of death, or at the day of judgment; *b.* Nor the dreadfulness of the day, nor the majesty of the Judge, nor the number of the accusers, nor the impartiality of the sentence nor the separation which shall then be made. 3. Why the believer shall never be ashamed: *a.* Sin, the cause of shame, is removed; *b.* Those only from whom he can reasonably fear shame, will never be ashamed of Him; *c.* He can look God and Christ, his own conscience and the whole world, in the face, without shame and suffering.—HENRY: What does God do for the salvation of His children? He prepares them beforehand for glory. Sanctification is the preparation of the soul for glory, making it meet to partake of the inheritance of the saints in light. This is God's work; we can destroy ourselves fast enough, but we cannot save ourselves; sinners fit themselves for hell, but it is God that prepares saints for heaven.—WATERLAND: There is a degree of pity and regard due even to very ill men, to ungodly, and sinners; not to be shown by caressing them and smiling upon them, but by earnest and ardent endeavors to reclaim them There is not a more forlorn or miserable wretch under heaven than an overgrown sinner, become mad, desperate, and incurable in his sins. For though such persons regard neither God nor man, nor have any mercy or tenderness for friend or brother, but would go any lengths in mischief, and set the world on fire, if it lay in their power, yet we very well know, all the while, that they are weak and impotent, and are under bridle and restraint. The utmost they can do is only to afflict and torment good men for a time here, while they themselves lie exposed to eternal vengeance, to torments everlasting hereafter.—DODDRIDGE: We know a descending, a risen Redeemer. He still visits us in His gospel, still preaches in our assemblies, and stretches out a gentle and compassionate hand to lead us in the way of happiness.—Where we see a zeal for God, let us pay all due regard to it, and compassionate that ignorance which may sometimes be mingled with it.—SCOTT: Modesty, caution, humility, and profound awe of the holy majesty of God, should restrain and guide the tongues and pens of all who speak or write on the great subjects connected with salvation, however satisfied such men may be with their own views of them; and every sentence which is written or spoken with impetuous injustice to God, is a proof of the pride and irreverence of the writer or speaker.—HODGE: Vers. 15–19. It should be assumed as a first principle, that God cannot do wrong. If He does a thing, it must be right. And it is very much safer for us, corrupt and blinded mortals, thus to argue, than to pursue the opposite course, and maintain that God does not and cannot do so and so, because, in our judgment, it would be wrong.—J. F. H.]

SECOND SECTION.—*More decided explanation of the mysterious fact. The faith of the Gentiles and the unbelief of Israel.*

CHAP. X. 1-21.

A. Self-righteousness, and the righteousness of faith (vers. 1-11).

1 Brethren, my heart's desire [*or,* good-will, εὐδοκία] and prayer[1] to God for
Israel [on their behalf][2] is, that they might be saved [for their salvation]
2 For I bear them record [witness] that they have a zeal of God, but not accord-
3 ing to knowledge. For they, being ignorant of God's righteousness [not knowing
(*i. e.,* mistaking) the righteousness of God], and going about [striving] to establish
their own righteousness,[4] have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness
4 of God. For Christ *is* the end of the law for [unto] righteousness to every
5 one that believeth.[5] For Moses describeth [writeth concerning] the righteous-
ness which is of the law, That the [saying, The][6] man which doeth those things
6 [who hath done them] shall live by them [*or,* in it].[7] But the righteousness
which is of faith speaketh on this wise [thus],[8] Say not in thine heart, Who shall
ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down *from above* [*omit from*
7 *above*]:) Or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ
8 again [*omit* again] from the dead.) But what saith it? The word is nigh thee,
even [*omit even*] in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which
9 we preach: That [Because] if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus
[*or,* Jesus as Lord],[9] and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath [*omit* hath]
10 raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believ-
eth [faith is exercised][10] unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is
11 made unto salvation. For the Scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall
not be ashamed [put to shame].

B. The equal claim of Jews and Gentiles to faith. Hence the necessity of universal preaching. The unequal results of preaching (vers. 12-18).

12 For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek [distinction be-
tween Jew and Greek]:[11] for the same Lord over all is [is Lord of all,][12] rich
13 unto all that [who] call upon him. For whosoever [every one who][13] shall call
14 upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall [can] they call[14]
on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall [can] they believe[15] in
him of whom they have not heard? and how shall [can] they hear[16] without a
15 preacher? And how shall [can] they preach,[17] except they be sent? as it is
written,[18] How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel [those who
16 bring glad tidings] of peace,[19] and bring glad tidings of good things! But they
have not all obeyed the gospel [did not all hearken to the glad tidings].[20] For
17 Esaias [Isaiah] saith, Lord, who hath [*omit* hath] believed our report?[21] So
then faith *cometh* by [of] hearing, and hearing by [through] the word of God.[22]
18 But I say, Have they not heard [Did they not hear]? Yes [Nay] verily, their
sound went [out] into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.

C. The unbelief of Israel and the faith of the Gentiles already prophesied in the Old Testament (vers. 19-21).

19 But I say, Did not Israel [Israel not][23] know? First Moses saith, I will
provoke you to jealousy by *them that* [with *those who*] are no people, *and* by
20 [with] a foolish nation I will anger you. But Esaias [Isaiah] is very bold, and
saith,[24] I was found of them that [by those who] sought me not; I was made
21 manifest unto them that [those who] asked not after me. But to [of] Israel he
saith,[25] All day long I have [*omit* have] stretched forth my hands unto a disobe-
dient and gainsaying people.

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 1.—[After δέησις, K. L. *Rec.* insert ἡ, defended by Philippi; omitted in ℵ. A. B. D. F. G., by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Tholuck, Alford, Tregelles. Probably inserted to limit πρὸς τὸν θεόν to δέησις, since it seemed improper to connect it with εὐδοκία. On the meaning of the last-named word, as involved in the critical question, see *Exeg. Notes*.

[2] Ver. 1.—[ℵ. A. B. D. F. G., all modern editors, read αὐτῶν, instead of τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (K. L. *Rec.*). The latter was substituted as an explanatory gloss, which was the more necessary, as this verse began a church lesson (Lange). Ἐστιν (to complete the sense) is inserted before εἰς σωτ. in *Rec.*, on the authority of ℵ[3]. K. L.; rejected by modern editors generally.

[3] Ver. 1.—[*Rec.* (ℵ[3]. K. L.) insert ἐστιν before εἰς σωτηρίαν. This probably led to the paraphrase of the E. V.

[4] Ver. 3.—[A. B. D., a number of versions and fathers, omit δικαιοσύνην after ἰδίαν. (So Lachmann, Tischendorf, Wordsworth, Tregelles.) It is found in ℵ. F. K. L., Syriac, &c.; also after ζητοῦντες in one cursive. It is retained by Meyer, Lange; bracketted by Alford, who, in his notes, agrees with the authors just named, in thinking the repetition to be original and emphatic, but easily deemed superfluous; hence the omission.

[5] Ver. 4.—[Dr. Lange's rendering is striking: *Denn das Endziel des Gesetzes ist: Christus zur Gerechtigkeit für Jeden, der glaubt* (For the end of the law is: Christ as righteousness for every one who believes). Luther's version is really a paraphrase: *Denn Christus ist des Gesetzes Ende; wer an den glaubt, der ist gerecht.*

[6] Ver. 5.—[The E. V. has translated ὅτι, which is here merely a quotation-mark (ὅτι *recitantis*). The above emendation is from the Revision by Five Anglican Clergymen. The ὅτι is found before τὴν δικ. in ℵ[1]. A. D[1].—an alteration, on account of the accusative after γράφει.—The quotation is from Levit. xviii. 5. If the reading of the *Rec.* be adopted, the only variation is ὁ, instead of ἅ; a change necessary to adapt the citation to its position here. See next Note.

[7] Ver. 5.—[The correct reading is difficult to determine. Most editors now retain αὐτά (*Rec.*, ℵ[3]. B. F. G., most versions and fathers). Instead of ἐν αὐτοῖς (Rec., ℵ[3]. D. F. L., some versions and fathers, Meyer, Wordsworth, Lange), the reading ἐν αὐτῇ is found in ℵ[1]. A. B., many versions, and is accepted by Lachmann, De Wette, Alford, Tregelles. The singular would be a variation from both the LXX. and the Hebrew; yet this but renders an alteration to the plural (for the sake of conformity) the more probable. On the other hand, Meyer urges strongly that the plural stands or falls with αὐτά, which is now generally accepted. The change to the singular may have been made to guard against the validity of the righteousness of works, as indeed A. substitutes πίστεως for νόμου. With some hesitation, I hold to the reading of the *Rec.*

[8] Ver. 6.—[From this point to the middle of ver. 8, we have a free citation from the LXX., Deut. xxx. 12–14. Parts of the verses are quoted, but there is only one considerable variation (at the beginning of ver. 7). As the LXX. does not differ materially from the Hebrew, we give only the text of the former: (ver. 11, ὅτι ἡ ἐντολὴ αὕτη, ἣ ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαί σοι σήμερον, οὐχ ὑπέρογκός ἐστιν, οὐδὲ μακρὰν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐστιν.) 12. οὐκ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω ἐστί, λέγων· τίς ἀναβήσεται ἡμῖν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ λήψεται ἡμῖν αὐτήν, καὶ ἀκούσαντες αὐτὴν ποιήσομεν; 13. οὐδὲ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης ἐστί, λέγων· τίς διαπεράσει ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ λάβῃ ἡμῖν αὐτήν, καὶ ἀκουστὴν ποιήσῃ αὐτήν, καὶ ποιήσομεν; 14. ἐγγύς σου ἐστὶ τὸ ῥῆμα σφόδρα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου, καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσί σου ποιεῖν αὐτό. The New Testament text is remarkably well established throughout. The variations from the LXX. are noticed in the *Exeg. Notes*.

[9] Ver. 9.—[B. has ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς, some fathers; others add ἐστιν. These readings are doubtless explanatory glosses, and, as such, tend to confirm the interpretation given in the brackets above: *Jesus as Lord.* See *Exeg. Notes*, also on the rendering *because*.—The E. V. improperly translates ἤγειρεν, *hath raised*. It is the historical aorist.

[10] Ver. 10.—[The E. V. has made this verb active, and the second one passive. Both are passive. It would seem as if this rendering was borrowed from the German: *man glaubt*, which exactly expresses the force of the Greek.

[11] Ver. 12.—[Literally: *there is no distinction of Jew and Greek*; but this sounds too abstract, as if the distinctions were obliterated, as in Gal. iii. 28. Here it is better, then, to preserve the concrete idea, by using *between*. So Rev. Five Ang. Clergymen.

[12] Ver. 12.—[Lange renders: *Denn Einer und derselbe ist Herr von Allen.* So Noyes: *For one and the same is Lord over all.* Five Ang. Clergymen: The same is Lord over all. The Amer. Bible Union as above. This is most literal. Alford, indeed, objects, "on account of the strangeness of ὁ αὐτός thus standing alone; but this is met by Dr. Lange in the *Exeg. Notes*, where he expands the phrase into: *One and the same Lord is Lord over all.* Stuart: *There is the same Lord*; which is harsh. On the whole, it is best to find the predicate here, and not supply *is* with *rich*, as is done in the E. V.

[13] Ver. 13.—[This is almost word for word from the LXX., Joel ii. 32 (Heb. iii. 5): καὶ ἔσται πᾶς, ὃς, κ.τ.λ. The γάρ is inserted to introduce the proof. In Acts ii. 21, the citation is made even more exactly. The strong form of the Greek is retained by rendering, *every one* whosoever (Alford, Five Ang. Clergymen); Amer. Bible Union, Noyes: *every one who*.

[14] Ver. 14.—[In each of the four interrogative sentences of vers. 14, 15, the exact form of the leading verb is doubtful. The *Rec.* in every case gives the future indicative, but the uncial authority supports the aorist subjunctive, the *deliberative* or *conjunctive* aorist. The MS. authority is given in the separate notes. Here the *Rec.*, with K. L., and some fathers, reads: ἐπικαλέσονται; ℵ. A. B. D. F. G.: ἐπικαλέσωνται. The future is supported by Meyer, and apparently accepted by Dr. Lange. The aorist is adopted throughout by most critical editors. (So Tregelles.) As the variation here involves only the change of ω into ο, it is readily accounted for. The E. V. gives a correct rendering of the future, which, indeed, in these cases differs little in meaning from the conjunctive. *Can* is substituted to express the force of the correct reading, although it is perhaps a shade too strong. The Amer. Bible Union omits *have* in the relative clauses throughout; but, although this is a literal rendering of the aorist, it here obscures the meaning by destroying the *litotes*. All other later versions properly retain the English perfect.

[15] Ver. 14.—[*Rec.*, A. K. L.: πιστεύσουσιν. ℵ. B. D. F. G. πιστεύσωσιν. The last two prefix the argument.

[16] Ver. 14.—[*Rec.*, L.: ἀκούσουσιν; ℵ[1]. D. F. G.: ἀκούσονται; [3]. A[2]. B.: ἀκούσωσιν; the latter, though not so well supported as the other aorists, is probably correct, since there is no reason for a change of tense.

[17] Ver. 15.—[*Rec.* (no MSS.): κηρύξουσιν; ℵ. A. B. D. K. L.: κηρύξωσιν. This well-supported aorist seems to decide the other cases.

[18] Ver. 15.—[Isa. lii. 7. The quotation is not exact, though giving the sense of the Hebrew. The LXX. is scarcely followed at all. See *Exeg. Notes*.

[19] Ver. 15.—[The words: εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην, τῶν, are omitted in ℵ[1]. A. B. C., by some versions and fathers; rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles; bracketted by Alford. They are found in ℵ[3]. D. F. K. L., many versions and fathers; retained by Meyer, Wordsworth, Lange, on the ground that the repetition might easily lead to the omission. This view will readily be allowed by any one who examines the passage, since it is easy to mistake the first occurrence of so long a word for the second. The original passage, of course, favors the retention.—The uncial authority against τά (*Rec.*) before ἀγαθά, is decisive. The E. V. takes away the exact parallelism by rendering εὐαγγελιζομένων by a different phrase in each clause. A paraphrase is necessary in any case, from the poverty of our language.

[20] Ver. 16.—[Here also *gospel* is too restricted. The above emendation is adopted by Amer. Bible Union, Noyes, Five Ang. Clergymen.

[21] Ver. 16.—[As none of the modern versions have altered this citation, it is allowed to remain, but the reader will find in the *Exeg. Notes* the view of Forbes, which would be thus expressed: *Who (of us) hath believed what we heard?*

[22] Ver. 17.—[ℵ[1]. B. C. D[1]., many versions (including the Vulgate) Χριστοῦ; adopted by Lachmann, Alford, Tregelles. The great majority of the fathers, of modern commentators sustain the reading of the *Rec.* (ℵ. corr. A. D[3]. K. L., some versions). Bede: *Dei Christi.* Alford deems the received reading "a rationalizing correction," while Meyer, De Wette, and most, think the other was a later gloss, which is more probable.

[23] Ver. 19.—[The order of the *Rec.* is poorly supported. א. A. B. C., and others: Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω, adopted by critical editors. The alteration in the order of the English text is sustained by modern versions.

[24] Ver. 20.—[The Hebrew text of Isa. lxv. 1, as far as cited by Paul, is:

נִדְרַשְׁתִּי לְלוֹא שָׁאָלוּ נִמְצֵאתִי לְלֹא בִקְשֻׁנִי׃

The LXX.: ἐμφανὴς ἐγενήθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν, εὑρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν. The variations are a transposition of the clauses, and ἐγενόμην, instead of ἐγενήθην. The Hebrew is followed with exactness.—Ἐν is inserted after εὑρέθην, in B. D[1]. F.; bracketted by Alford and Tregelles.

[25] Ver. 21.—[The order of the LXX. is: ἐξεπέτασα τ. χ. μ. ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν; otherwise the citation is exact. The καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα is an addition of the LXX. The Hebrew gives but one adjective, סוֹרֵר, *rebellious.*—*To Israel*, is not correct; *with respect to, concerning*, is the meaning, which, however, is sufficiently indicated by *of*; so Five Ang. Clergymen, Amer. Bible Union.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary.—The fact of the partial rejection of Israel, &c. The fact is not a fatalistic decree, for the Apostle prays for Israel, and bears record to their zeal; vers. 1, 2. It rests rather on the antithesis between self-righteousness as the presumed righteousness which is of the law, and the righteousness which is of faith; vers. 3, 4. The righteousness of faith, although arising from Israel, is proved by the prophecy of the Old Testament to be, according to its nature, accessible to all men, and not confined to the Jewish nation. It is universal; that is, accessible to all in its internal character, because it is allied to the inward nature of man; vers. 5, 9. Its universality is confirmed by experience; vers. 10, 11. It is proclaimed by the Old Testament Scriptures, which promise, in Christ, salvation to every man. There arises therefrom the universality of faith—the freedom of faith to Jews and Gentiles; vers. 12, 13. This freedom of faith is made actual by the universality of the preaching of the gospel and of the apostolic mission; vers. 14, 15. Unbelief is voluntary, like faith. The gospel is conditioned by faith; vers. 16–18. But the faith of the Gentiles is prophesied in the Old Testament, as well as the unbelief of the Jews; vers. 19–21.

[There is little difference of opinion among commentators respecting the meaning of this chapter as a whole. Dr. Hodge coincides most nearly with Dr. Lange in his divisions. Tholuck, Philippi, Meyer, Alford, make two sections. (1.) The further exposition of the fact that the exclusion of Israel is founded on their own unbelief; vers. 1–13. Alford: "The Jews, though zealous for God, are yet ignorant of God's righteousness (vers. 1–3), as revealed to them in their own Scriptures (vers. 4–13)." (2.) Proof from Scripture of the same fact; vers. 14–21. Tholuck: "They could not excuse themselves by this, that God had not done His part to make humanity know the gospel, or that it had not reached them, or that they could not have seen what *their* conduct with regard to it and *God's* dealings with the Gentiles would be." The connection with chap. ix. 33 is very close; and as the Apostle is accustomed to repeat, at the close of an argument, the proposition from which he started, the repetition of the quotation of chap. ix. 33, in ver. 11, favors the division of Dr. Lange.—R.]

Faith, vers. 1, 2. *The fact described is no fatalistic decree.*

Ver. 1. **Brethren** [Ἀδελφοί. Bengel: "*Nunc quasi superata praecedentis tractationis severitate comiter appellat fratres.*" Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 20; Gal. iii. 15.—R.] Though this is an address to all readers, yet it is directed with special feeling to the Jewish Christians. Repetition and carrying out of the personal reference in chap. ix. 1 ff.

My heart's desire, or, **good-will** [ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας]. A real antithesis to the μέν is contained in the judgment passed in ver. 3. [See Winer, p. 535; who thinks the antithesis was too painful to be expressed. All admit that the thought is found in ver. 3.—R.] Meyer, contrary to Chrysostom, Theodoret, and most of the early writers, as well as De Wette and Olshausen, holds that εὐδοκία cannot mean *wish*, *desiderium*, but only *benevolence* (Vulgate, *voluntas;* Augustine, *bona voluntas;* Calvin, *benevolentia*). Tholuck: "There is, indeed, no example as yet in which εὐδοκία is exactly equal to 'wish.' But how could the Apostle have said, 'My good pleasure and my prayer for them to God are directed to their salvation.'" Yet he regards it advisable to adhere to the translation: My *good-will* for them. [The lexical objection to rendering εὐδοκία, *desire*, is weighty. On the other hand, the rendering *good-will* severs it from the context. The insertion of ἡ after δέησις was probably an attempt to avoid this difficulty. Alford suggests a "a mixture of constructions: the Apostle's εὐδοκία would be their *salvation itself*—his δέησις, κ.τ.λ., was εἰς σωτ." We hold to the more usual meaning of the word. Wordsworth pushes it as far as this: "Probably he uses this word because he wishes to represent the salvation of the Jews as a thing so consonant to God's wishes and counsel, that, as far as He is concerned, it is as good as done; and the Apostle delights in looking back, in imagination, upon that blessed result as already accomplished." There is little warrant in the word or context for such an interpretation.—R.]

And prayer to God [καὶ ἡ δέησις πρὸς τὸν θεόν. The latter phrase can be limited to δέησις without adopting the poorly supported ἡ. The "prayer" was undoubtedly "of his heart," but there are no grammatical reasons for connecting that phrase with these words. Δέησις is, strictly, *petition, request.*—R.] We refer καὶ ἡ δέησις back to καρδίας, and then exclusively to πρὸς τὸν θεόν. My heart is not only full of good-will toward the Jews, but it can also venture to intercede for them before God—a proof that they falsely regard me as their adversary—and I have not yet given up the hope of their salvation. This also comprises a pledge of Divine compassion. [So Bengel: "*Non orasset Paulus, si absolute reprobati essent.*"—R.]

[**On their behalf is for their salvation,** ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν εἰς σωτηρίαν. The correct reading shows how close the connection with chap. ix. is. Meyer: "Σωτηρία is the *end* which my εὐδοκία would have for them, and my prayer asks for them." The E. V. gives the correct sense though in a paraphrase.—R.]

Ver. 2. **For I bear them witness** [μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς. Γάρ introduces the reason for the preceding declaration.—R.] He still sees, even in their error, something good: **they have a zeal of God** [ζῆλον θεοῦ ἔχουσιν. *Zeal for God*, not *great zeal*, or *godly zeal*]. (Acts xxi. 20; xxii. 3; Gal. i. 14; John ii. 17.) This will, indeed, not be the only ground of his εὐδοκία, but is the ground of the cheerfulness of his intercession for them.

But not according to knowledge [ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν. Comp. chap. iii. 20, p. 123; Col. i. 9 (Lange's *Comm.*, p. 17).—R.] The ἐπίγνωσις is the knowledge which, being the living principle of discernment, impels far beyond the mere historical γνῶσις. Meyer's definition: *in consequence of* the ἐπιγν., is incorrect. The antithesis: κατὰ ἄγνοιαν, Acts iii. 17. The Apostle's statement may, at all events, be designed to alleviate his charge. The bright as well as the dark side of the religious zeal of the Jews was and is a peculiar phenomenon in the history of the world. [The objective advantages of the Jews were given in chap. ix. 1–5; here we have the subjective religiousness, which corresponds, although degenerating into blind fanaticism. Yet religious fanaticism, we infer from this passage, is preferable to religious indifferentism. There is something to hope for, a ground for good-will, where there is earnestness.—R.]

Vers. 3, 4. *Self-righteousness, and the righteousness of faith.*

Ver. 3. **For they, not knowing (mistaking) the righteousness of God** [ἀγνοοῦντες γὰρ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην]. We take ground, with De Wette, and others, against Meyer, who does not see in the idea of ἀγνοοῦντες the element of mistake, but merely the declaration of *ignorance*. [Meyer justifies his position, by saying that Paul was only proving the "not according to knowledge."—R.] But simple ignorance, without guilt, could have no meaning whatever in the present instance; and still less could it be the cause of wicked results. The same holds good of chap. ii. 4; 1 Cor. xiv. 38; see also Tholuck, *in loco*. Their ἀγνοεῖν is the cause of their seeking to establish their own righteousness, and consequently they did not submit themselves to the Divine righteousness revealed in the gospel for faith.*

And striving to establish their own righteousness [καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν δικαιοσύνην ζητοῦντες στῆσαι. See *Textual Note* [4]]. Essentially, it is the same as the righteousness of the law, according to Phil. iii. 9. Formally, this expression is stronger, because it not only signifies *acquired* righteousness in distinction from that which is *bestowed*, but as the real principle of this acquired righteousness, it denotes one's own choice, power, and will, as well as man's own will in opposition to God's choice, grace, and order. [The point of this distinction is lost, if the phrase be construed as = *their own justification.*—R.] Therefore this effort remains a nugatory ζητεῖν στῆσαι (chap. iii. 31; Heb. x. 9). The στῆσαι expresses the element of pride in their effort.

[**Have not submitted themselves, &c.**, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ . . . οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν.] Meyer regards the ὑπετάγησαν as passive, as in chap viii. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 28. Tholuck, on the other hand, correctly regards it as reflexive.*

Ver. 4. **For Christ is the end of the law** [τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός]. **First**, τέλος must be left in its full signification, and not be considered merely as the negative end by which the νόμος is made void; second, Χριστός is = Christ himself, not simply the foundation, the fundamental law of His theocracy (Meyer), or the *doctrina Christi* (Socinians, and others). In both cases, Meyer's explanation † would destroy the full meaning of the text. The same thing is declared in reality by the passages, Matt. v. 17; Rom. xiii. 10; Gal. iii. 24; Eph. ii. 15; Col. ii. 14. The end of the law was Christ, because Christ was, in a positive form, the fulfilment of the spiritual, essential import of the law, and therefore He was, at the same time, the making void of the imperfect Old Testament form of the law. Comp. 1 Tim. i. 5; 1 Peter i. 9; Rev. xxi. 6; xxii. 13. The centre of the idea is therefore *final aim, purpose, and end* (Chrysostom, Melanchthon, Calvin, and others). There is no good ground for dividing this explanation into two different ones. On one hand, Erasmus, Wolf, and others, have brought out the positive view: Fulfilment of the law. The alternative here: *obedientia activa*, or *obed. activa* and *passiva* (see Meyer), must be removed. As for the negative view of the idea, Meyer cites a large number of authorities who harmonize with him in limiting it to this; yet he can hardly prove this by Augustine, Olshausen, and many others.‡ Even ver. 4 plainly says that Christ is in so far τέλος νόμου as He is **unto righteousness to**

[4] [Stuart, and others, take the phrase *righteousness of God* here as = *God's method of justification.* How incorrect this is, will appear from a reference to p. 74 ff. Dr. Hodge says, very properly: "It is that on which the sentence of justification is founded." Alford: "that *righteousness*, which avails before God, which becomes ours in justification."—R.]

* [Alford defends the passive sense, as expressing the *result only*, it might be themselves, or some other that subjected them—the historical fact was, they *were not subjected*. But as this verse presents an antithesis to μέν (ver. 1); and as the whole current of thought implies their personal guilt, the middle sense is preferable, and is adopted by the majority of commentators.—R.]

† [Meyer thus paraphrases: "For in Christ the validity of the law has come to an end, that righteousness should become the portion of every believing one."—R.]

‡ [Dr. Lange's view is, on the whole, to be preferred; but he does not clearly state those of other commentators. We append, therefore, the three opinions most in favor. (1.) Christ is the *aim* (*Endziel*) of the law. (So Chrysostom, Calvin, Beza, Bengel, Alford, Webster and Wilkinson, and others.) This view means either (*a.*) the end of the law was to make men righteous, and this end is accomplished in Christ (Chrysostom, Stuart, and others); or, (*b.*) the law led to Him, as schoolmaster (Calvin, and others, Tholuck reaches this from another point of view). (2.) Christ is the *fulfilment* of the law (τέλος = πλήρωμα). This is, indeed, true, but scarcely meets the requirements of this passage, especially if *law* be limited to the ceremonial law. (3.) Christ is the *termination* of the law (Augustine, Luther, Tholuck, Meyer, Hodge). This is the chronological view, which Dr. Lange calls the *negative* one. In what sense he is the termination of the law, is also a matter of dispute (ceremonial, or moral?). Some confusion exists in most commentaries in the citing of authorities. In fact, these meanings largely run into each other. In favor of the last, it may be urged that the Apostle is drawing such a contrast here between the righteousness of the law and the righteousness of faith (vers. 5, 6), as requires a strong antithesis between the law and Christ; but unless we interpret: "When Christ came, the old legal system was abolished, and a new era commenced" (Hodge), this antithesis will not be correct. Yet the fact that Paul quotes from the law itself to support the claims of the righteousness of faith, seems inconsistent with this view. (See below.) Nor will it be evident how this verse introduces a proof of the non-submission of the Jews to the righteousness of God (ver. 3), unless it asserts that the law led to Christ, rather than that Christ abolished the law. All three views may be included but the first is the more prominent one.—R.]

every one that believeth, *εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι*, and the *γάρ* introduces just the proof that the Jews did not submit themselves *to the righteousness of God*, which, however, was manifested in Christ's fulfilment of the law (comp. chap. ix. 31). The question of the extent of prominence here given to the negative side of the *τέλος*, is connected with the explanation of vers. 5 and 6. [Stuart, following Flatt, renders *εἰς*, *with respect to*. It is better to take it as indicating *result* or *purpose*. The former will be preferred, if *τέλος* be rendered *aim;* the latter, if it be rendered *termination*. The sense will then be, either: Christ is the *aim* of the law, so that righteousness may come to every one, &c.; or: Christ abolished (or fulfilled) the law, in order that, &c. The word *righteousness* has here the full sense, "righteousness of God;" but the emphasis rests on *believeth*.—R.]

Vers. 5–9. *The universality of the righteousness of faith is proved by the Old Testament also.*

On the citations. It is evident that vers. 5 and 6 present an antithesis between the idea of the righteousness which is of works and the inward essence of righteousness. But it is clear from the place of the citations, that this antithesis means no contradiction between the Old and New Testament. The quotation in ver. 5 is taken from Lev. xviii. 5; the quotation in ver. 6 from Deut. xxx. 11–14. It is evident, therefore, that the Apostle places the two sides of the law in contrast, one of which is an external Jewish law of works, and the other is an inward law of the righteousness which is of faith, or a law designed for the inward life; the one is transient, the other permanent. Therefore, he takes his first statement from Leviticus, and from that part of it where the laying down of the Mosaic obstacles to marriage is introduced; the second, on the other hand, is taken from Deuteronomy, which early imparts a profoundly prophetical meaning to the law. Therefore we read, first: *Moses describeth*, or *writeth* (and what he writes is a command); but then, *The righteousness which is of faith spea eth* (and what it says is a proclamation). Though the Apostle holds Deuteronomy to be as fully Mosaic as Leviticus, yet, in the former, Moses administers his office as the Old Testament lawgiver of the Jews; while, in the latter, the prophetic spirit of the righteousness of faith speaks as decidedly through him as if it altogether took his place.

Ver. 5.* **For Moses writeth respecting the righteousness,** &c. [*Μωυσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην, κ.τ.λ.* The accusative after *γράφειν* is either governed by the verb in the transitive sense: *to write of, to describe*, or is the remote object, that concerning which it is written. The rendering: *describeth* is perhaps too strong, though lexically admissible.—R.] *Γράφει*, John i. 46. The citation is from Leviticus, according to the LXX., but of the same purport as the original text.

We further read: Moses writeth down, or commands: **The man who hath done them** [*ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος*]. The *ποιήσας* is emphatic, yet it is significantly connected with *ἄνθρωπος*. *Αὐτά*, that which is written, the commandments; the law, in the analytical form of commandments. The emphasis here rests *on the doing.* "But the righteousness which is of faith says: 'The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; only confess with thy mouth, and believe in thy heart.'"

Shall live by them [*ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς*. See *Textual Note* [7]. If *αὐτῇ* be adopted as the correct reading, it refers to the righteousness accruing from the doing of the commandments (Alford). Dr. Lange renders *ἐν*, *durch*, but this is too strong; *in the strength of*, is better.—R.] The different readings appear to have arisen from an apprehension that the Apostle's expression might cause a misunderstanding, perhaps an acceptation of the possibility of righteousness by works. Hence the omission of *αὐτά*, and the reading *ἐν αὐτῇ* ("He shall live by righteousness itself"). Cod. A. even reads: *τὴν δικ. ἐκ πίστεως*. A proof how decidedly the early Church rejected the righteousness of works. The assurance of life has been referred to the life in Palestine. But the historical standpoint of the Mosaic economy indicates something further than the *vita prospera*. Proof: 1. The *vita prospera* in the real sense, or as the welfare of the people, is a special promise for obedience to parents; Exod. xx. 12. 2. The most direct meaning of the passage in Leviticus is, that the transgression of the following statutes is connected with the punishment of death; chap. xviii. 29. 3. The passage in Deut. xxx. 16, not to mention Ezek. xx. 11, indicates something further than the mere *vita prospera*.*

There are here two antitheses: first, that of the externality of the law and the inwardness of the gospel; second, that of doing and experiencing. In the first case the promise reads: *shall live by them;* and in the second case there is the assurance: *he shall be delivered, shall be saved.* We have already observed that the Apostle did not wish to say that there is a contradiction between the Moses of Leviticus and of Deuteronomy; we may now ask, whether he has instituted an irreconcilable contrast between the two passages. This is very supposable, if ver. 5 be regarded as a purely hypothetical and almost ironical promise: If one fulfil all the commandments of the law, he would certainly live by them; but since no one is capable of this, no one can find life by the commandments. Therefore, after ver. 6, the gospel now takes the place of the law. [So Hodge, and others.] But this cannot be the Apostle's meaning. For, first, in that case the law would have been useless from the beginning. Second, an analytical fulfilment of the law would be designated as analytical, or at least as a theoretical way of life, by the side of the practical, and thus two kinds of righteousness would be conceivable, as well as two kinds of *life*. But, in our opinion, ver. 5 is not merely designed to prove that the law is at an end, but that its end has come because Christ has come. Therefore the expression in ver. 5 has an enigmatical form, as that in 1 Tim. iii. 16. Moses inscribes his precepts thus The man which doeth those things—

* [The translator found it necessary to make some changes in the order of the original. In making the additions, it was found to be impossible to avoid confusion, without further transpositions. Nothing has been omitted, but it has been an unusually difficult task to present Dr. Lange's notes in a shape that would correspond to the order of the Apostle's words.—R.]

* [To this may be added the exalted sense which *ζωή* has in the New Testament. Comp. Tholuck, Trench (referring to Christ's calling himself *ἡ ζωή*): "No wonder, then, that Scripture should know of no higher word than *ζωή* to set forth either the blessedness of God, or the blessedness of the creature in communion with God." *Syn. New Testament*, § xxvii.—R.]

that is, who truly fulfils them—shall live by them. To be sure, the most direct Jewish social sense of this declaration was, that the observer of the commandments should not be subject to death, but *live*. But in its religious meaning, the law was as a sphynx, whose riddles every Israelite should attempt and try hard to solve until he came to self-righteousness, until the people became matured, and until the *Man* came who solved the riddle.* In Leviticus the significance of the form of the passage under consideration, "the man which doeth those things shall live by them," appears in the addition: "*I am the Lord.*" The Lord holds up the prize, and pledges it; Christ has won it. Thus ver. 5 means not only the fact that Christ has made void the law by the fulfilment of the law, but also that he has transposed and transformed it from the whole mass of external precepts to a principle of the inward life. Therefore the Apostle can immediately assume, in ver. 6, that Christ is known and is near to all, and accordingly apply the statement of Deut. xxx. 11–14.

Ver. 6. **But the righteousness which is of faith** [ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη]. Just as Moses has referred prospectively to Christ by the law, so does the righteousness which is of faith, or the gospel, refer retrospectively to Him.† The connection of the declaration in Deuteronomy is as follows: in chap. xxix. the curse is threatened the people if they become apostate; and in chap. xxx. mercy is promised them if they be converted. Ver. 10: (The Lord will bless thee) "if thou turn unto the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul." Then, the ground of the possibility of such a conversion consists in the heartiness in the real spiritual nature of the law, which will always reassert and prove itself. The Apostle fully develops this christological germ by applying the promise of the righteousness of faith from the law to the gospel. The development is as follows:

1. As the inward character of the law was nigh and intelligible to the Jews at that time, or during the previous period in general, so nigh and intelligible must Christ, as the end of the law, now be to them.

2. As Moses, at that time, referred to an unbelief which regarded the law as merely external, arbitrary, and therefore foreign, far-fetched, so does there now stand in the way an unbelief, which mistakes and regards as an odd and peculiar phenomenon the near Christ, the nearness of Christ, which lies in His affinity to the inmost necessities of the heart.

3. If, at that time, the unbelieving Jew could say, "Who shall bring down the law?"—namely, that which was once neglected and lost—from above that means, in the language of the present, "Who shall bring Christ down from above?" although He has come upon the earth, and has here finished His life, and incorporated himself with humanity.

4. If, at that time, the unbelieving Jew said: "Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring the law to us?"—that is, as much as to say from the future world, the lower regions—that question is now. "Who shall bring Christ to us from the dead?" although Christ has risen from the dead, and has sealed His resurrection by the outpouring of His Spirit.

5. But just as, at that time, the essence or word of the law was infinitely near to Israel as an *outline* of its most personal and inward nature, so is now Christ, or the gospel by Him, still more than the fulfilment and completion of the most inward nature of man to righteousness and salvation. For if the law was already glorious, how shall not the gospel exceed in glory? 2 Cor. iii. 7–11.

Speaketh thus [οὕτως λέγει]. The Apostle's decided intention of finding in the passage in Deuteronomy itself the real sense which he further expounds, is evident from the fact that he allows the righteousness which is of faith, personified in that passage, itself to speak. The multifarious surprise expressed by expositors on the Apostle's citation is chiefly traceable to a defective construction of the passage in Deuteronomy. According to Meyer, the meaning of the Mosaic passage is: The commandment is neither too hard nor too far; the people speak of it, and it is impressed in their hearts, in order that it may be performed. De Wette adopts the same view. According to Tholuck, the words would say: The faithful observance of the law is made so easy to man after the revelation that has taken place. But how can Moses say to the people, whose apostasy he hypothetically assumes, in their apostasy: Thy God will again accept thee if thou turn to Him, for thou hast the law in thy mouth and in thy heart—in the sense that the people are still living in the knowledge of the law, that the law is still in their hearts, and that they only need to perform it? The explanation of ver. 14 lies rather in ver. 15: The law is the true life of man himself; it is his real good. The transgression of the law is death and evil. God can therefore deliver man from the transgression of the law, because the law is as an inalienable appointment in his heart, and because he returns to his God when he comes to himself (Luke xv. 17). Because of this inwardness of the law in itself, it can be written upon man's heart (see Deut. xxx. 6); it can always revive afresh in him. The law is therefore not merely concealed from, or foreign to, man; it is not simply something positive from heaven, which may again altogether vanish to heaven; and it is no simple promise or threat from the future world, or from the realm of the dead, "from over the sea," which may be forgotten until death. Rather, it is still with Christ. For undoubtedly the Apostle will not merely say, in ver. 8, Faith is so nigh to men, because Christ is preached to them as the One who has become man, and is risen from the dead; but because the truth of Christ's incarnation and resurrection can unite, in the faith of their heart and in the confession of their mouth, for the completion and salvation of their inmost nature. The typical prophecy of the Mosaic passage, which Paul, the great master, has strikingly brought out, lies in the

* [Dr. Lange thus attempts to avoid the two opposing views (1.) that an actual outward obedience was followed by actual temporal blessings, and that this was all the saying of Moses meant; (2.) that the law belonged to a covenant of works, the conditions of which could not be fulfilled. The first is altogether out of keeping with the Apostle's argument. The second seems to put the law in a wrong position; for the law, although made a mere expression of the condition of a legal righteousness, is really something far more; it is the schoolmaster, &c., comp. chap. vii. and Gal. iii. 19–25. The antithesis between vers. 5 and 6 is not absolute, but relative. Even the doing and living, pointed to Christ, was fulfilled in Christ; who, by His vicarious doing and living, makes us *live and do*.—R.]

† [Stuart: "*But justification by faith speaketh thus.* The sense is the same as to say: 'one who preaches justification by faith, might say,'" &c. This is scarcely allowable, for it transfers the whole passage altogether out of the period of Moses' words, besides putting a limited and inexact meaning upon δικαιοσύνη.—R.]

fact that conversion to the law is the beginning of its hearty reception, but that faith in the gospel is its completion; or, objectively defined, that the law is the shadow of the inward life, and that Christ is the life of this life itself.

On the different misunderstandings of this typical prophecy, see Tholuck, who speaks of a *profound parody*, p. 557 ff. Explanations: Only an *application* of the words of the law in the Old Testament (Chrysostom, Theodoret, &c., down to Neander); *accommodatio* (Thomasius, Semler); *ὑπόνοια* (Grotius); *allusio* (Calixtus); *suavissima parodia* (Bengel, and others).*

The explanations divide themselves into two principal classes. According to one, Paul has made use of the words of Moses for clothing his thoughts, with the knowledge that they, considered in themselves, expressed something altogether different. Philippi calls it "a holy and lovely play of God's Spirit upon the word of the Lord." But would not that be a very unlovely play of the Apostle upon the word of the Lord? Likewise Tholuck is of the opinion, that there has been a failure to prove an application corresponding to the meaning of the text, and, still less, the identity of the historical meaning with the Pauline interpretation. Naturally, the constructions of this class are partly of a critical (Semler) and partly of an apologetical nature (Bengel).

The other class accept, that in the declaration of Moses the Apostle has really found the prophecy declared by him. But this again divides into two subdivisions: 1. He was the expositor of that passage in his spiritual illumination as an Apostle; 2. Rather, one intimately acquainted with the rabbinical hermeneutics. Calvin, and others, who belong to the first subdivision, hold that *universa doctrina verbi divini* is meant; Knapp, the commandment of love toward God; Hackspan, and others, the messianic promise; Luther, who is frequently hesitating, belongs to both of the principal classes (Tholuck, p. 558). The expositors of the other subdivision regard Paul's interpretation as an allegorical exegesis—that Paul, using the Jewish expository art, has allegorized the passage, and has found in it a Midrash, or secret meaning. Meyer regards the sum of the oracular meaning to be this: "Be not unbelieving, but believing!" A Midrash, indeed, which might well be drawn from every verse of the Bible.

[The majority of commentators adopt the view, that Paul does not cite the words of Moses as such, but merely adapts them to his purpose. But the position of Dr. Lange seems preferable, not only because this "adaptation" or "accommodation" is not what we would expect from such a writer as Paul, but because the other view is more in accordance with the context. As Forbes well says: "St. Paul's great object in reasoning with his countrymen is to prove to them, *out of their own Scriptures*, that God's mode of salvation, from the first, had been always the same (simple faith in Him), and that their Law was but a provisional dispensation, designed to prepare for the universal Gospel, which was to embrace all equally Gentiles as well as Jews. Is it likely that the arguments adduced to persuade the Jews of this from their own Scriptures would, even in part, be words turned from their true meaning in the Jewish Scriptures?" Vers. 2 and 3 show how necessary this proof is. This view accords, too, with ver. 4, and the real position of the law. Alford: "The Apostle, regarding Christ as the *end* of the law, its great central aim and object, quotes these words not merely as suiting his purpose, but as bearing, where originally used, an *à fortiori* application to faith in Him who is the end of the law, and to the commandment to believe in Him, which is now '*God's commandment*.' If spoken of *the law* as a manifestation of God in man's heart and mouth, much more were they spoken of Him, who is *God manifest in the flesh*, the *end of the law and the prophets*." "In this passage it is Paul's object not merely to *describe* the righteousness which is of faith in Christ, but to *show it described already in the words of the law*." Thus the connection as well as the contrast of law and gospel are preserved. This view suits the precise circumstances of the original utterance (see Forbes, pp. 356 ff.). That the variation (in ver. 7) and the omission of parts of the original, do not interfere with it, is obvious.—R.]

Say not in thine heart [*μὴ εἴπῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου*. LXX.: *λέγων*; Hebrew, לֵאמֹר. The passage is taken out of its grammatical connection, and "in thine heart" added, as might well be done. The phrase is = *think not* (Alford).—R.] This is the ever-recurring secret or expressed language of the unbeliever. Revelation is something thoroughly heterogeneous and strange to, and in disagreement with, my nature. To the words *say not*, Paul has added *in thine heart*, perhaps to bring out the contradiction, that a witness of faith can assert itself in the same *heart* in which unbelief speaks negatively.

Who shall ascend into heaven? [*Τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν;* The *ἡμῖν* of the LXX. is omitted.] This formerly meant: It is impossible to bring down from heaven the law (that which we have lost, because it was foreign to us); but it now means: Who shall bring Christ down from heaven, that He may become man? the incarnation of the Son of God is inconceivable. Thus the actual incarnation of Christ is, to Paul, the full consequence of the moral truth of the Mosaic law.

[That is, to bring Christ down, *τοῦτ' ἔστιν Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν*]. The *τοῦτ' ἔστιν* lays down the meaning of the Old Testament language in the New Testament sense. On the different explanations of it, see Tholuck, p. 565 [The two leading interpretations are (1.) *That is to say*—*i. e.*, whoever asks this question, says, in effect, Who will bring Christ down? thus he denies that He has come already—makes of the Incarnation an impossibility. (So Erasmus, Calvin, Philippi, and others.) (2.) *That is, in order to bring Christ down.* This gives the purpose of the ascending. In this view, *τοῦτ' ἔστιν* is = the rabbinical זֶה. This implies also a denial of the Incarnation. See Meyer In its favor is the fact, that a final clause follows in Deuteronomy. The reference to the present position of Christ at the right hand of God (Calvin Reiche, and others) is out of keeping with the con

* [So Hodge: "Without directly citing this passage, Paul uses nearly the same language to express the same idea." Stuart: "It is the *general* nature of the imagery, in the main, which is significant to the purpose of the writer. Paul means simply to affirm that, if Moses could truly say that his law was intelligible and accessible, the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ is still more so." But this method of regarding the passage is open to very grave objections. It regards Paul as sanctioning that dangerous use of Scripture, "by way of accommodation," which is evidently wrong, judged by its evil effects on preacher and people at the present day.—R.]

text, especially the order in ver. 9. The passage has been tortured into a variety of special applications, but the majority of commentators now support the reference to the Incarnation, though differing as to the precise character of the questions (see below). It should be noticed, that this view assumes the certainty of the preëxistence of Christ.—R.]

Who shall descend into the deep? [*ἢ Τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον;* LXX.: *τίς διαπεράσει ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης*]. An explanation of the Mosaic passage: *Beyond the sea!* According to Schulz, (*Deuteronomium*), *Beyond the sea* refers only to the vast extent of the sea. This would be tautology in relation to the foregoing. To bring from beyond the sea, can also not mean (according to Vitringa), to bring over from the Greeks. That the sea may be considered as תְּהוֹם, ἄβυσσος, is proved by the harmony of the Septuagint. But תְּהוֹם is not יָם, and *over* the sea is altogether a different idea from *into* the deep. The probable solution of the difference is, that the ideas *over the ocean* and *beneath the earth* coincide as designations of the realm of the dead. The Greek Tartarus is, indeed, under the earth, but not a real cavern under the earth. The Greek Elysium lies far out in the ocean, on the Isles of the Blessed. Also, in the present passage, Paul has evidently found the realm of the dead to be indicated by the words *beyond the sea*. Similar notions existed among the Celts and Germans. Meyer dismisses the question in a very untenable manner, when he says: The view of Reiche, Bolten, and Ammon—that the place of the blessed (over the sea) is also meant in the Hebrew—confounds a heathen representation with the Jewish one of Sheol (see Job xxvi. 5, 6).

[Dr. Lange (following Chrysostom, De Wette, Meyer, and others) assumes throughout that these questions are questions of *unbelief*, although finding in the passage something more than Meyer's brief statement: "Be not unbelieving, but believing." Alford gives a full discussion of the three views: questions of *unbelief*, of *embarrassment*, of *anxiety*. He combines all three: The anxious follower after righteousness is not disappointed by an impracticable code, nor mocked by an unintelligible revelation; the word is *near him*, therefore *accessible; plain and simple*, and therefore *apprehensible*—deals with *definite historical fact*, and therefore certain; so that his salvation is not contingent on an amount of performance which is *beyond him*, and therefore *inaccessible; irrational*, and therefore *inapprehensible; undefined*, and therefore *involved in uncertainty*. Thus, it seems to me, we satisfy all the conditions of the argument; and thus, also, it is clearly brought out that *the words themselves* could never have been spoken by Moses of the righteousness which is of *the law*, but of that which is of *faith*." Dr. Hodge does not clearly define which view he adopts, although objecting to the thought, that the object is to encourage an anxious inquirer.—R.] The reference of unbelief to an unbelief in the sitting of Christ at the right hand of God (by Melanchthon, Calvin, and others), removes the centre of the object of faith; this centre is the resurrection.

Ver. 8. **But what saith it?** [*ἀλλὰ τί λέγει;*] After the Apostle has shown what the righteousness which is of faith forbids saying, he brings out what it says itself to unbelief. Rückert and Philippi [Hodge and Stuart] have intensified too much the antithesis between Moses and the righteousness of faith; Meyer obliterates it by formally referring even the expression concerning the righteousness of faith to "For Moses writeth." [The former position is almost inseparable from the view of ver. 4, and of the use of Old Testament language which these commentators hold.—R.]

The word is nigh thee [*ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν*]. The *ἐγγύς σου* is stronger than if it were *ἐγγύς σοι*. It is one next to thee, a neighbor, a relative of thine. The opinion of Chrysostom, Grotius, and others [held to some extent by Stuart, Hodge, and others], that this verse is an assurance how easy it is to become righteous, is foreign to the context. We must not suppose that this is an expression of merely the historical acquaintance with Christianity. If this were the case, how could it be said to the doubter and unbeliever: It is **in thy mouth and in thy heart?** [The Apostle evidently here says, not what *is*, but what *may be*, just as Moses had done (Tholuck).—R.] But as the word of life, which should be peculiarly in the mouth and in the heart, it is attested in a twofold way. First, it is **the word of faith,*** **which we**, the apostles, as God's heralds and Christ's witnesses, **preach.** Second, its effect is, that he who confesses Jesus with the mouth as his Lord, and believes in his heart that He is risen from the dead to a blessed life, shall be saved.

Ver. 9. **Because** [*ὅτι*. The E. V. follows Beza, the Vulgate, &c., in rendering *ὅτι*, *that*, indicating the purport of the word preached. Dr. Hodge gives, besides, a view which connects this verse directly with the former part of ver. 8: *it says that*, &c.; but this is opposed by any proper view of the citation from Deuteronomy. The sense, as now generally agreed (Tholuck, Stuart, De Wette, Meyer, Alford), is that of *because*, or *for*, giving a proof of what precedes. To *mouth* and *heart* correspond confession and belief. This purport of the preaching would scarcely be stated in this form.—R.]

[**If thou shalt confess with thy mouth**, *ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς ἐν τῷ στόματί σου*. Confession is put first here, on account of the connection with the words quoted in ver. 8. This is a further proof of the meaning *because*. In ver. 10, belief comes first.—R.]

Jesus as Lord [*κύριον Ἰησοῦν*. The mass of commentators are disposed to take *κύριον* as a predicate placed first for emphasis, and render as above. So Tholuck, Stuart, Hodge, De Wette, Meyer, Schaff, Webster and Wilkinson, Noyes, Lange. Alford doubts this interpretation; comp. his note *in loco*. See *Textual Note* ⁷. Hodge: "To confess Christ as Lord, is to acknowledge Him as the Messiah, recognized as such of God, and invested with all the power and prerogatives of the mediatorial throne." Used in such close connection with a citation from the LXX., which translates Jehovah by the same word *κύριος*, it certainly means more than an acknowledgment of power and moral excellence; especially as this part of our verse corresponds with the coming down from heaven alluded to in ver. 6.—R.] Just as the words "Lord Jesus" correspond with *to bring down from heaven*, so **raised him**

* [Either *the word respecting faith*, or, which forms the substratum and object of faith (Alford). The latter is to be preferred, since *word*, just before, must be taken in a very wide sense, as including the whole subject-matter of the gospel. *The personal object of faith is near*, is certainly implied in ver. 7; but this is not directly expressed here.—R.]

from the dead corresponds with *to bring up from the dead*.—[**Thou shalt be saved,** σωθήσῃ. Belief, *with the heart*, in the central fact of redemption, the resurrection, not as an isolated historical event, but as linked indissolubly with the coming down of the Son of God, now the ascended Lord—and hence confession of Him as such—these are the requisites for salvation. "A dumb faith is no faith" (Olshausen).—R.]

Ver. 10. *The experimental proof of the righteousness which is of faith.*

For with the heart faith is exercised unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. The Apostle presents, in this verse, the parallelism with reference to ver. 9, and the underlying passage of Deut. xxx. 14. Yet he now reverses the order of *heart* and *mouth*, in harmony with the genesis of the life of faith, especially in the New Testament. As a matter of course, faith and confession are connected with each other, just as the heart and the mouth, or as the heart and speech; that faith without confession, would return to unbelief, but confession without faith would be hypocrisy. However, the distinction is correct: first, faith in the heart, then, confession with the mouth. There is the same distinction of effects. Faith in the heart results in justification; confession with the mouth — that is, the decided standing up for faith with word and deed—results in σωτηρία in its final signification, deliverance from evil to salvation, with the joy and freshness of faith.* It is natural to man that only that first becomes his complete possession and his perfect joy which he confesses socially with his mouth, and which he maintains by his life. See Tholuck, p. 571, on the apprehension of the early Protestant orthodoxy, that by a distinction of the two parts εἰς δικαιοσύνην and εἰς σωτηρίαν prejudice would be done to the doctrine of justification.† The doctrine of the righteousness which is of faith has, indeed, been carried to such excess, that it has been regarded as prejudiced by the requirement of the fruits of faith in the final judgment. This reduces it to a dead-letter affair, and is a failure to appreciate the necessary elements in the development of life. The Apostle's testimony is so decidedly one of experience, that it expresses the permanent force of the law of faith by the passive forms: πιστεύεται, ὁμολογεῖται. This is its custom; thus is the kingdom of heaven taken by force.

Ver. 11. *The testimony of Scripture for the righteousness of faith.*

For the Scripture saith (Isa. xxviii. 16). "Πᾶς," says Meyer, "is neither in the LXX. nor in the Hebrew, but Paul has added it in order to mark the (to him) important feature of universality, which he found in the unlimited ὁ πιστεύων."* This is, in meaning, certainly contained in the הַמַּאֲמִין. The weight of the clause lies in the fact that only faith is here desired. The Apostle has very justifiably referred the ἐπ' αὐτῷ to Christ.

Shall not be put to shame. That is, shall attain to salvation (see chap. v. 5; ix. 33).

B. *The universality of faith.* Vers. 12, 13. *The testimony of Scripture for the universality of faith.*

Ver. 12. **For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek** [οὐ γάρ ἐστιν διαστολὴ Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἕλληνος. This rendering is more literal than that of the E. V. See *Textual Note* [11]. *Greek* stands here for *Gentile*. Comp. chap. i. 18; also in chap. iii. 22.—R.] No difference in reference to the freedom of faith; in reference to the possibility and necessity of attaining to salvation by faith. The right of faith is the same to Jews and Gentiles. Proof:

For the same is Lord of all [ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς κύριος πάντων. See *Textual Note* [a].] Strictly speaking, we must suppose a breviloquence also here: One and the same Lord is Lord over all. The one Lord is Christ, according to Origen, Chrysostom, Bengel, Tholuck, and most other expositors (see ver. 9). Others refer the expression to God (Grotius, Ammon, Köllner, &c.); Meyer, on the other hand, has good ground for observing that it was first necessary to introduce the Christian character,† as Olshausen has done ("God in Christ"); see Acts x. 36; Phil. ii. 11.

Rich. [Lange: *erweisend sich reich.*] Πλουτῶν (see chap. viii. 32; xi. 33; Eph. i. 7; ii. 7; iii. 8).

Unto all [εἰς πάντας. Alford: *toward all;* Lange: *über Alle;* Meyer: *für Alle, zum Besten Aller;* Olshausen: "By εἰς is signified the direction in wihch the stream of grace rushes forth."—R.] This is both the enlargement and restriction of Christ's rich proofs of salvation. Only *those* **who call upon him** [τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν], but also *all who call upon him*, share in His salvation. The calling upon Him is the specific proof of faith, by which they accept Him as their Lord and Saviour.

Ver. 13. [**For every one whosoever,** &c., πᾶς γὰρ ὅς, κ.τ.λ. See *Textual Note* [12]. Scriptural proof: Joel iii. 5. [LXX. and E. V., ii. 32.] Tholuck: "The omission of the exact form of the quotation occurs either in universally known declarations, as in Eph. v. 31, or where the Apostle makes an Old Testament statement the substratum of his own thought, as in chap. xi. 34, 35." Paul has specified the name κύριος in Joel as the name of the God of revelation, in harmony with the messianic passage. [If we accept a reference to Christ in ver. 12, we must do the same here, as, indeed, the next verse also requires. Alford well says: "There is hardly a stronger proof, or one more irrefragable by those who deny the Godhead of our Blessed Lord, of the unhesitating application to Him

* [Alford thus paraphrases: "With the heart, faith is exercised (πιστεύεται, men believe) unto (so as to be available to the acquisition of) righteousness, but (q. d., not only so; but there must be an outward confession, in order for justification to be carried forward to salvation) with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." "Σωτ. is the '*terminus ultimus et apex justificationis*,' consequent not merely on the act of justifying faith, but on a good confession before the world, maintained unto the end."—R.]

† [Dr. Hodge is very guarded here "By confessing him before men, we secure the performance of His promise that He will confess us before the angels of God." But surely we may not fear to interpret salvation as an actual salvation, begun here in us, and to culminate at that time, when we shall be thus confessed.—R.]

* [Alford: "The Apostle seems to use it here as taking up παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, ver. 4." At all events, there is a recurrence to the starting-point, chap. ix. 33 where the same passage was cited, and this enlargement of it is at once established in the verses which follow. A weighty monosyllable!—R.]

† [However means that, if God is referred to, we must add this definition, "God in Christ;" which is altogether arbitrary, as he well remarks.—R.]

by the Apostle of the name and attributes of Jehovah."—R.]

Vers. 14, 15: *The realization of the universal righteousness of faith through the universality of preaching and the apostolic mission.*

Ver 14. **How then can they call on him?** [πῶς οὖν ἐπικαλέσωνται εἰς, κ.τ.λ. See *Textual Note* [14], and below.] The proof, clothed in the vivacious form of a question, of the necessity of the universal apostleship and of his preaching, is a sorites. Faith in the Lord precedes *calling upon Him* (in order to be saved); the hearing of the message of faith precedes faith; but His message presupposes preachers, and preaching presupposes again a corresponding mission. From this it then follows, that the apostolate urges forward the preaching in the name of the Lord, and that unbelief in the apostolic message is disobedience to the Lord himself.* The view of Grotius and Michaelis, that vers. 14 and 15 are a Jewish objection and excuse, complicates the Apostle's perspicuous train of thought. But Chrysostom and others have correctly observed, that he here establishes the universal apostleship by virtue of the institution of faith, even in respect to the Jews, and to the narrow Jewish Christianity; but, according to Meyer, he does not reach this point until ver. 18 ff., where, indeed, he first makes full application of its establishment. Meyer: "Important Codd. have the conjunctive (deliberative) aorist instead of the futuro, which Lachmann has accepted. But the testimony is by no means decisive. [See *Textual Note* [14]. On the future, see Winer, p. 262.—R.] The subjects of those who call are all who are called to salvation, Jews and Gentiles, in the universal sense. [Or, as Alford suggests, "*men*, represented by the πᾶς ὃς ἄν of ver. 13."—R.] Thus the preachers, in vers. 14 and 15, are still indefinite (De Wette, and others, against Meyer).

[**How can they believe,** &c., πῶς δὲ πιστεύσωσιν οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν. On the construction of the genitive οὗ, see Meyer; comp. Eurip., *Medea*, p. 752. Meyer seems scarcely justified in insisting upon the correctness of the Vulgate: *quomodo credent ei, quem non audierunt.* The E. V. gives the proper meaning.—**Without a preacher,** χωρὶς κηρύσσοντος. Tittmann, *Syn. N. T.*, p. 93: χωρίς *ad subjectum, quod ad objecto sejunctum est, refertur,* ἄνευ *autem ad objectum, quod a subjecto abesse cogitatur.* Dr. Lange may be correct in claiming that the preachers are as yet indefinite, but the beautiful precision of the Greek requires us to find an intimation of the certainty of the universal gospel proclamation. In the first two questions, there is an absolute negative; in the third, χωρίς occurs, implying the probability that one will preach; in the last, we have ἐὰν μή, which indicates that, however men may fail to call and hear, those who will preach will certainly be sent forth. This turn of expression seems to have escaped the notice of commentators, but it points directly toward the position the Apostle is establishing: the universality of the means provided by God for the salvation of men, whether they hear or forbear.—R.]

* [Dr. Hodge: "It is an argument founded on the principle, that if God wills the end, He wills also the means." He properly opposes Calvin's view, that the Apostle is proving the design of sending the gospel to the Gentiles from the fact that they have received it. Still, Dr. Lange's view (which is that of De Wette and Meyer) seems yet more exact, since the providing of the means is more marked in this passage than their success. -R.]

Ver. 15. [**And how shall they preach, except they be sent?** πῶς δὲ κηρύξωσιν ἐὰν μὴ ἀποστολῶσιν;] The definite preachers spring first from the divine mission. But the Apostle proves, by Isa. lii. 7, that there must be such sent (apostolic) preachers.

As it is written, How beautiful, &c. The Apostle here repeats the prophet's announcement in an abridged and free manner, but yet in strict conformity with the sense; following the original text more closely than the LXX. According to Meyer, the prophetic passage in question speaks of the happy deliverance from exile, while the Apostle has very properly interpreted it in its messianic character as a prophecy of the gospel preachers of the messianic kingdom. But the full, mysterious messianic import of the prophetic passage extends beyond the meaning of a typical prophecy as verbal prophecy. The beauty of the feet of the messengers of peace is hardly spoken of, because the feet of the one who approaches become visible (Tholuck), but because they, in their running and hastening, in their scaling obstructing mountains, and in their appearance and descent from mountains, are the symbolical phenomena of the earnestly desired winged movement and appearance of the gospel itself. Paul has left out the mountains, and has given the collective singular a plural form, according to the sense; peace has to him the full idea of the gospel salvation; the good things are the rich, displayed, saving blessings which proceed from the one salvation.

Vers. 16–18: *But as the gospel is, on the one hand, naturally free and universal in relation to the antithesis of Jews and Gentiles, so, on the other, it is, according to its inward nature, conditioned by the antithesis of faith and unbelief.*

Ver. 16. **But they did not all hearken to the glad tidings** [Ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. The aorist is historic; during the preaching (Alford). Hence the general reference is to be admitted, especially as the ἀλλά contrasts with the preaching to "all," the limited result.—R.] Theodore of Mopsvestia and Reiche do violence to the connection in reading these words as a question. Fritzsche holds that they refer to the Gentiles; and Meyer, to the Jews. But they refer chiefly to the difference between believers and unbelievers in general, for there were also unbelievers among the Gentiles; and, above all, the question was the general establishment of the antithesis: believers and unbelievers, and then its application to Jews and Gentiles.

Lord, who believed our report? [Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; An exact quotation from the LXX.] This citation from the prophet Isaiah, chap. liii. 1, is mainly a strong proof of this: that the preaching of salvation does not meet with faith on the part of all to whom it is preached, although in this citation the reference to the Jews comes out more definitely. The hyperbolical expression of the prophet means: "Only a few believe." The entire contents of Isa. liii. prove that here we have not only to deal with a typical prophecy, but also with a verbal one.

On the different interpretations of ἀκοή, see Tholuck, p. 577: "*That which is preached*," "to preach what is heard from God." Meyer: "The preaching which is apprehended;" or, in which the stress rests upon the right apprehension (the words of obedience).—*Not all.* That is, not all within the reach of

preaching (ἀκοή, שְׁמוּעָה). [The word ἀκοή has occasioned much difficulty. For, if rendered *report*, *preaching*, here, then it would seem natural to give it the same sense in ver. 17. But if this be done, then "word of God" must receive an unusual meaning (see below). Generally the commentators have admitted his meaning here without question, and then in various ways met the subsequent difficulty. Forbes, however, strikes at the root of the matter, and claims that there is no ground for rendering שְׁמוּעָה, *report* —*i. e.*, what we cause others to hear. His view has been adopted by Hengstenberg, and is the most satisfactory solution yet offered. Ἀκοή, like the Hebrew equivalent, he claims with reason,* refers to the message viewed from the side of the *hearer*, not from that of the *preacher*. The prophet is speaking in the name of his countrymen, as he does throughout the chapter: *Who* (of us) *hath believed that which we heard?* (See Forbes, pp. 362 ff.) This view is more literal; it does not disturb in the least the general drift of the argument, while it relieves ver. 17 of a great difficulty. In fact, Meyer, Alford, and others, approach this sense, but too indirectly; this is as simple as it is satisfactory.—R.]

Ver. 17.† **So then faith cometh of hearing** [ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς]. From the ἀκοή. Explanations: The message preached (Tholuck, Meyer [Hodge, and most]); the act of hearing (Calixtus, Philippi, and others); hearing with faith (Weller, and other Lutheran expositors). As this preaching does not meet with universal faith, only the announcement itself can be meant. [Accepting Forbes' explanation of ἀκοή in ver. 16, we apply it here: Faith comes from *what is heard*, not the act of hearing—which gives a different sense from ver. 16; nor what is preached—which confuses this word and ῥῆμα.—R.]

And hearing through the word of God [ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος θεοῦ. See *Textual Note* [22] on the reading Χριστοῦ.] Different explanations of the ῥῆμα θεοῦ: 1. God's revealed word (Tholuck, and others); 2. God's order, commission (Beza, Meyer [Hodge], and others). The ground: Because otherwise ῥῆμα θεοῦ would not be different from ἀκοή. But strictly speaking, both definitions are indissolubly united in the revealed word with which prophets and apostles were entrusted. The Divine message, as such, is a formal sending, or a commission and a material sending; or, with these, also a preaching. Therefore Tholuck does not appear to be correct, when he says that τὸ ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπί τινα denotes not God's order, but His oracles; Jer. i. 1, &c. Nevertheless, there does exist a difference between this ῥῆμα and the ἀκοή; ἀκοή is every message of salvation to the end of the world; but the ῥῆμα θεοῦ denotes the Divine sources of revelation, on whose effluence the authority and effect of every message depend: The word, and the fact, and the effect in life taken together. Therefore διὰ ῥήματος. [*The thing heard is through or by means of the revelation of God.* This is the sense, if we adopt the usual meaning of ἀκοή; and, indeed, it gives ῥῆμα a simpler sense. De Wette suggests that ῥῆμα prepares for τὰ ῥήματα in the next verse.—R.]

Ver. 18. **But I say, Did they not hear?** [ἀλλὰ λέγω, μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν;] The indefinite *it* [which Dr. Lange supplies] is regarded by Meyer as denoting the ἀκοή; and, according to Tholuck, as that which has heretofore been the subject under consideration; which is sufficient. [All the difficulty about the verb here disappears, if Forbes' view be accepted. There is no necessity for going back to ver. 14, or making the matter indefinite. The Apostle has been speaking of the necessity of *hearing*, of the *thing heard;* now he says, *did they not hear?* The universality of the privilege is affirmed.—R.] Although reference is constantly made to the Jews, the question is nevertheless, principally and formally, concerning unbelievers in general. If unbelievers, as unbelieving people, can excuse themselves by saying that they have not heard God's message, the most direct answer would be: "Then they would not be unbelievers in the specific sense." But the Apostle rather brings out the fact of the incipient universal propagation of the gospel, by clothing it in the language of Ps. xix. 4, from the LXX.

[Nay, verily, μενοῦνγε. Comp. chap. ix. 20. So far from this being the case, **their sound went out into all the earth,** &c., εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, κ.τ.λ. An exact quotation from the LXX. (Ps. xviii. 5; Heb. xix. 5; Eng., xix. 4.—R.] In the Psalm, the question is undoubtedly the universal revelation of God in nature; therefore we cannot regard it as a real prophecy, and as an argument in the usual sense. However, the Apostle seems to clothe his view of the incipient universality of the gospel in those words of the Psalms, *because he perceived in the universal revelation of nature the type and guarantee of the future revelation of salvation.* Then, his having given to the φθόγγος αὐτῶν* another reference, also corresponds to this freer application of the passage (there, the sound of God's works; here, the preacher). [Dr. Lange here follows the mass of commentators (including Stuart, Hodge). But Calvin, Stier, Hengstenberg, Alford, Forbes, regard these words "as possessing a real argumentative force, when interpreted according to their genuine meaning as designed at first by the Psalmist." Alford urges the fact: "that Ps. xix. is *a comparison of the sun, and the glory of the heavens* with the *word of God.*" Calvin: "As He spoke to the Gentiles by the voice of the heavens, He showed by this prelude that He designed to make himself known at length to them also." Dr. Lange, it is true, approaches this view, yet does not find it in the Psalm, but in the Apostle's use of it. Was the Apostle likely to convince his countrymen by putting a new meaning on their Scriptures?—R.]

On the gross misconstruction of this passage, that the gospel should extend everywhere, even at Paul's time, see Meyer [p. 408, 4th ed.]; Tholuck, p. 580. As for the ecstatic salutation of the universality of God's kingdom, then first appearing, which often occurs in Paul (see Col. i. 23), compare the two statements of Justin Martyr and Tertullian in Tholuck, p. 880. That which appears surprising i...

* [This is the classical usage, and all the New Testament passages can be quite as readily explained thus. The Hebrew word is not Hiphil, yet the common interpretation forces a Hiphil sense upon it.—R.]

† [Stuart has a singular view respecting this verse. He finds in it the suggestion of the Jewish objector, whom he has already discovered in vers. 14, 15, to the effect that "many of the Jews are not culpable for unbelief, inasmuch as they have not heard the gospel, and hearing it is necessary to the believing of it."—R.]

* [The LXX. thus renders קַוָּם, which means, first, their *line*; then, from the string of an instrument, *their sound*.—R.]

the hyperbolical form of the Apostle's statement of the universal propagation of the gospel, disappears just in proportion as that propagation is regarded not *quantitatively*, but *qualitatively*. Jerusalem and Rome were the centres of the ancient world. But, in addition to them, there were many other general centres. The error of expounding the passage in the sense of a quantitative universality could not hold good, even if we admit that the gospel had at that time reached America; the whole of the fifth grand division of the world, as well as all Africa, would also have to come into consideration.

C. *The faith of the Gentiles and the unbelief of Israel.* Vers. 19–21: *Prophesied already in the Old Testament.*

Ver. 19.* **But I say, Did Israel not know?** [μὴ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω;] The Apostle now passes over to the long-prepared antithesis of unbelieving Israel and of the believing Gentiles. But yet, in his representation of this fearful inversion (which stirred up unbelieving Judaism) of the old theocratic relation—according to which the Jews were God's people, and the Gentiles were given up to themselves—he has recourse to the witnesses of the Old Testament respecting the beginning and prospect of this inversion. After the first question: "Have unbelievers not heard the gospel?" there follows the second: "Did not Israel *know* it?" We may now ask: What is referred to? Explanations:

1. That the gospel should pass from the Gentiles to the Jews (Thomas Aquinas, Calovius, Tholuck [Stuart, Hodge, Jowett], and others). But that threat was only conditionally uttered, and is not contained in the foregoing.

2. The gospel (Chrysostom, and others). [Here must be classed Calvin and Beza, who supply: the truth of God; Philippi and Forbes: the word or message of God (from ver. 17). The last named defend their view, from the emphasis which seems to rest on Israel (in the correct reading), and from the parallelism with ver. 18. Meyer opposes, with reason, the μή-οὐκ, which anticipates an affirmative answer; nor is this objection met, by saying that an affirmative might be expected, that Israel ought to have known the gospel. Paul knew too sadly that the reverse was the fact.—R.]

3. That the gospel should become universal, according to the preceding language of the Psalm (Fritzsche, De Wette [Alford], Meyer).* Meyer places Tholuck also in this category. Tholuck, however, now declares for (1.), as follows: "But yet the following prophetic declarations do not contain so much the universality of preaching, as explanations of the inverted relation which God will assume toward Gentiles and Jews."

At all events, the citation immediately following is not simply a proof of the universality of the gospel. But it only follows therefrom, that a new statement is made with the proof. This also holds good of the last quotation. The progress is as follows: *a.* Universality; Ps. xix. *b.* The faith of the Gentiles for the awakening of the faith of the Jews; Deut. xxxii. 21. *c.* The faith of the Gentiles; Isa. lxv. 1. *d.* The unbelief of the Jews; Isa. lxv. 2. Therefore we regard the explanation of Fritzsche, &c., as correct, and all the more striking, as the fulfilment of this very ancient prospect just now became an offence to Israel.—Proof:

First Moses saith [πρῶτος Μωυσῆς λέγει. *First*, "in the order of the prophetic roll" (Alford), with reference to Isaiah, as one among the many who spoke afterward to the same effect. Wetstein, Storr, Flatt, join πρῶτος with οὐκ ἔγνω, but on insufficient grounds.—R.] The future universality of the Abrahamic blessing had been declared earlier, but it was Moses who first declared that there should be no difference between Jews and Gentiles before God's righteousness; indeed, that possibly the Gentiles, in their good conduct, might be preferred to the Jews in their bad conduct. Thus the same Moses who communicated to Israel its economic advantages over the Gentiles, was he who had set up the rule of faith by which this relation could possibly be inverted in the future.

I will provoke you to jealousy [Ἐγὼ παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς. The only variation from the LXX. (which closely follows the Hebrew) is the substitution of ὑμᾶς, in each clause, for αὐτούς.—R.] Thus Moses speaks to Israel in the name of the Lord; Deut. xxxii. 21.

With those who are no people [ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει. The precise force of the preposition is with difficulty conveyed by any English word. It is not = *against*, although that is implied; nor = *by means of*, but rather, *on account of*. *With* expresses the weaker shade of instrumental force sufficiently well, but the real sense is: *aroused on account of and directed toward* a no-people.—R.] בְּלֹא־עָם. The Gentile nations were not recognized as true nations in the idea of the people, because they were devoid of that religious and moral principle which transforms nature into a moral nationality; see chap. ix. 25; 1 Peter ii. 10. גּוֹי, from גָּוָה, denotes, strictly speaking, the increasing mass of natural human beings; עַם, from עָמַם, a connection, assembly, community. [The words *people, nation*, are used in the E. V. to preserve the distinction between the Hebrew words. Despite the fact that the LXX. has used the same word to render both, it has not been overlooked in the E. V. in this passage.—R.] The explanation of the "no-people" (the οὐκ denies the idea contained in a *nomen* connected with it), is found in the following parallel:

By a foolish nation [ἐπὶ ἔθνει ἀσυνέτῳ].* The religious and moral folly of the Gentile consisted in his not seeking God's signs with resignation; for which reason they also could not seek Him. Paul, with good ground, sees in the thoroughly prophetic song of Moses, which looked far beyond Israel's history in the wilderness and its relation to the Canaanites (Deut. xxii. 43), a typical, and still more than a typical prophecy, which should be fulfilled in many ways in preludes, and which has finally been fulfilled in the *almost* complete changes of the relation between Israel and the Gentiles in relation to the gospel. In ver. 21, neither Israel's idolatry in the wilderness, nor the Canaanite people, is meant alone. On the different untenable explanations, including those of Philippi, see Tholuck, p. 588 [given above].

* [Bretschneider and Reiche take *Israel* as the object of the verb, and supply *God* as subject. Did not God know Israel? But this is arbitrary, and not in accordance with the context.—R.]

* [Noyes, in his version, preserves the parallelism of the verbs; παραζηλώσω, παροργιῶ, by the paraphrase: *I will move you to jealousy, I will excite you to indignation.*—R.]

Ver 20. But Isaiah is very bold, and saith [Ἡσαΐας δὲ ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει. Lange: *But Isaiah even ventures to say;* which is the spirit of the Greek. Bengel: *Quod Moses innuerat, Esaias audacter et plane eloquitur.*—R.]. The Apostle regarded it as great boldness in Isaiah to say the words of chap. lxv. 1 and 2 in the hearing of the Jews, as the first verse, according to his explanation, expressed mercy to the Gentiles, and the second the hardness and apostasy of the Jews.

[I was found by those who sought me not, *Εὑρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, κ.τ.λ.* See *Textual Note* [24], for the text of the Hebrew original and the LXX., to the former of which Dr. Lange refers so frequently. The Apostle has transposed the clauses.—R.] The question is now raised first of all by the later exegesis, whether Paul's explanation of Isaiah's passage is correct? Meyer says: "In its strict sense, Isa. lxv. 1 (freely from the Septuagint, and with an inversion of both the parallel members) treats of the *Jews;* but in a typical sense, which Paul clearly perceives in it, they are types of the *Gentiles,*" &c. But in this case, Paul would have made an exegesis without any evidence, and would have exposed himself to the legitimate contradiction and censure of the Jews. Tholuck also remarks, that if the Apostle, in ver. 1, referred directly to the Gentiles, his application would have to be regarded as having missed its object. In the first place, namely, Tholuck says that rabbinical expositors (Jarchi, &c.) have "simply and satisfactorily" explained vers. 1 and 2 as relating to the same subjects. He further says: "Independently of these rabbinical predecessors, the same explanation has been adopted by Gesenius, Ewald, Hitzig, and Umbreit, which last writer translates: *I was to be inquired of.*" There is just ground for disapproving of Luther's confidence in inserting in ver. 20: *to the Gentiles,* and in beginning ver. 21 with a *for—for I speak,* &c. Yet the exegetical authorities cited are utterly refuted, not only by Paul's authority—although we cannot even admit that in one of his last sword-thrusts he has made not merely a random stroke, but even wounded himself—but also by the connection of the whole of Isaiah's passage, chap. lxiii. 7–lxvi. The antitheses in general between the strongly Old Testament Jewish prayer in chap. lxiii. 7 ff., and the prophetical New Testament answer of God in chaps. lxv. and lxvi., are first to be considered. It is said that the prayer is undoubtedly designed to express Israel's state of mind; that it contains angry and passionate elements; and that the Lord must so reveal himself that *the Gentiles will tremble* at His name (ver. 17; chap. lxvi. 1). The prayer is a conflict between the profoundest contrition and the most painful dejection, and it dies away in a question which sounds like a reproach. The Lord now answers, it is said, in the cold reproach: "I was to be sought." And this is claimed to be the simplest rendering of נִדְרַשְׁתִּי. But what does the Lord answer in relation to the people of Israel, and in relation to the Gentiles? In chap. lxiv. 8 ff. we read: "Thou art our Father; we are the clay, and thou our potter," &c. Finally: "O Lord, wilt thou hold thy peace, and afflict us very sore?" Compare here the answer in chap. lxv. 2, and further. In ver. 8 the familiar thought again recurs to the prophet: A remnant of the people will be saved; from ver. 18 onward he explains by a grand antithesis. From this antithesis there then arises the description of the new Israel, which was to be called by another name (ver. 15). On the Gentiles, see chap. lxvi. 12, 18, 19, 21. But the antitheses between chap. lxv., vers. 1 and 2, come still more into consideration. In ver. 1 we read, אֶל־גּוֹי; in ver. 2, אֶל־עַם. The גּוֹי, in ver. 1, is לֹא־קֹרָא בִשְׁמִי, which could not very well denote the Israelites, whether the people be considered passive or active (see Tholuck, p. 556), as the question in both cases is the official form of their religion; עַם, on the other hand, in ver. 2, is designated as סוֹרֵר; it is a people pledged to the Lord, but is now an apostate people. The antithesis is still stronger, that the Lord is now a subject of *search* on the part of a people (*Goi*) which had never inquired after Him; that He is found by those who did not seek Him, and must merely be found with the words הִנֵּנִי הִנֵּנִי, while He had to spread out His hands in vain the whole day to a rebellious people. In ver. 1, a people is spoken of which *now* not only inquires after the Lord, but even *searches* after Him; but, in ver. 2, it is a people which has so fully turned away from Him, that He seeks it the whole day in vain. Thus the פֵּרַשְׂתִּי, in ver. 2, rather than נִדְרַשְׁתִּי at the beginning, must be read as a strengthened preterite. The Lord answers the question, whether He would afflict very sorely, by referring to His compassion to the Gentiles (Jerome). Then He explains, in ver. 2, how this turning from them has occurred. "I have spread out my hands" (in vain), &c. The exegetical abridgment of this last chapter is connected with an abridgment of the whole of the second part of Isaiah. Tholuck, not satisfied with the defence of the older interpretation of this passage by Hengstenberg, Hofmann, and Stier, takes a middle position between Paul and the expositors cited, by remarking "that the prophet did not speak, in ver. 1, of the Gentiles, and yet that Paul did speak, in ver. 2, of the Jews." But what would the ἀποτολμᾷ then mean? Paul could, indeed, have good ground for not naming the Gentiles, because a consequent exclusion of the chosen substance of Israel could have been inferred. Stier's explanation is therefore so far correct as it holds that, in ver. 1, Israel is added, yet not after its first call, but after its dissolution into the "no-people" of the Gentile world.* [There is no other view of the passage, except that which refers it, as originally used, to the Gentiles, that consists with Paul's prudence as a reasoner, much less with his apostolic authority and inspiration. To the argument of Dr. Lange nothing need be added.—R.]

Ver. 21. **But of Israel** [πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραήλ]. Erasmus, *adversus;* De Wette, [Philippi, Alford (Meyer, *an*)], and others, *with respect to Israel;* Vulgate and Rückert, *to* Israel. We adopt *with respect to,* since the prophet had already made the foregoing declaration *to* Israel.

He saith [λέγει]. Namely, Isaiah, in the name of God.—**[All day long I stretched forth my hands,** Ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου.] The *spreading out of the hands,* says Tholuck, is not (as Fritzsche would have it) the *gestus* of the one inviting to his embrace,† but, according to Chrysostom, the *gestus* of the sup-

* [Stier, *Jesaias, nicht Pseudo-Jesaias,* pp. 797 ff.—R.]

† [So Conybeare: "The metaphor is that of a mother opening her arms to call back her child to her embrace."—R.]

pliant. Between the two meanings of this *gestus* there lies also a third; and, after all, one does not preclude the other. The principal idea is the *gestus* of gracious, importunate, and expressed admonition, of entreaty, compassionate sympathy, and continuous appeal.

And gainsaying [καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα]. Meyer holds, contrary to Grotius, and most expositors, that the ἀντιλέγ. must not be understood as *stubborn*, but *contradictory*. But *contradiction*, in the sphere of religion, is the decisive expression of *opposition*. [Philippi thinks this added attributive expresses the positive side of disobedience; the other, ἀπειθοῦντα, the negative. If so, both were necessary to convey the full meaning of the Hebrew word used by the prophet. "They say to God, offering them salvation: *we will not*."—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The intercession of the believer a sign of hope and salvation to those for whom it is made.

2. The bright and dark sides of religious zeal. If it be not purified by progressive, living knowledge, it becomes peverted into the carnal zeal of fanaticism. On the first appearance of Jewish fanaticism, see the *Commentary on Genesis* [p. 564, Amer. ed.].

3. Self-righteousness has many forms. The starting-point is the effort for the righteousness of the law, not as it is attained inwardly by simplicity and humility, but as it, by self-complacency and impurity, falls into externality. In this direction the righteousness of the law becomes the righteousness of works; and from this there results self-righteousness, which branches out into many forms—into the ecclesiastical and political form of confessional and partisan righteousness; into the ecclesiastical and scholastic form of doctrinal righteousness (orthodoxism); into the worldly form of moral righteousness; into the pietistic form of righteousness of feeling; and into the philosophical and brutal forms of the denial of all personal guilt. In all forms it inverts the relation between God and man—between the Creator and the creature—between God's sovereignty and man's own will—between God's law and the self-made service and law—between grace and works—and between the ground of life and the most outward false show. Its real want is the *want of the heart's upward look* at the throne of God's eternal majesty; and this want is also the first guilt; the positive *ruin* connected therewith is the baseness of the mind's look at things below; the lost state of the mind's look in the abject beholding of self. But as this self-righteousness is so thoroughly selfish that it misunderstands and scorns the proffer of God's freely-given righteousness, the gospel of grace, so is it likewise selfish in connecting itself inseparably with fanaticism.

4. Christ is the end of the law, because He is the fulfilment of the law; therefore He is, on one side, the end where the law is changed into the collective principle of the new birth; and, on the other, He is the end in which it lays off its eternal Old Testament form and meaning; just as ripe fruit becomes freed from its bondage in the husk. See *Exeg. Notes*.

5. Ver. 5. The doctrine of eternal life has developed itself embryonically by stages: In this life, God's blessing, God's glorious deliverance from the manifold danger of death, and, in the future, the peaceful slumber of those delivered from beds of earthly suffering, their celebration of the marriage supper of the Lamb, and their safety in Abraham's bosom, &c. This development, just as every biblical doctrine, has taken place in organic conformity to the law. According to Tholuck, p. 557, the eschatology of the Jews of Palestine at the time of Christ had already attained to the idea of *eternal life*. Yet they hardly attained to the idea of eternal life in the Christian sense. [It must ever be remembered that the ideas, *immortality* and *eternal life*, are not identical. Ζωή has a new meaning in the New Testament. Comp. the thoughtful remarks of Trench, *Syn. N. T.*, § xxvii.—R.]

6. The righteousness of faith speaks even in Moses, if Moses be properly understood and explained. [Comp. *Exeg. Notes* on vers. 7-9.—R.]

7. The truth of the inward essence of the law, like that of the gospel, and therefore the truth of the whole saving revelation of God, is based on its inward character—on its inward union with the most inward nature of man. Its impregnability and incorruptibility also rest upon the same basis. Just as man must return from all by-ways (for his salvation or for his judgment) to the idea of God, so also must he return to the idea of the God-man, of guilt, the atonement, deliverance, the new birth, and the new and eternal life. The objection urged against revelation, and especially against Christianity, that this religion beclouds the earthly life by an exclusive representation of heaven, and the present by an exclusive assertion of the future, the realm of the dead, and duration after death, is removed by a passage which the Apostle cites and elaborates from Deuteronomy. Christ is on the earth in so far as He has become inseparably incorporated with it by His historical presence and union with humanity; and He is just as much in this life, and present in His judgments and bestowals of salvation, as He is in the eternal world, as the future Finisher of all things.

8. Faith and confession; see *Exeg. Notes*. The delivering power of confession. Because it: 1. makes inward faith irrevocable; 2. Breaks loose from unbelief; 3. Unites with believers, becomes flesh and blood, and, in a good sense, acquires worldly form, worldly power, and the power of manifestation; 4. Pledges itself to full consistency in word and deed, life and death. Christians have had good ground for holding martyrdom in such high honor. But if martyrdom can be exaggerated and overvalued, how much more can a confessional righteousness be overvalued, which seeks its protection and peace under the shadow of formulas!

9. The centre of faith and the centre of confession; see ver. 9. The centre of faith is Christ's resurrection, with all that it comprises; the centre of confession is Jesus as the Lord, and therefore not "the Christianity of Christ," but the Christ of Christianity. [Hence the Apostle does not say: If thou shalt confess with thy mouth my doctrine, and believe in thine heart in justification by faith, thou shalt be saved; yet how often he is represented as saying this, and no more. The living Christ is not in such a gospel.—R.]

10. With the complete freedom of revelation and of God's people there has also come the full protection of faith against unbelief.

11. The riches of the Lord to a praying human world.

12. The order of the gospel message. Its necessity, its promise, its authority, its condition (the Divine mission; direct or indirect). See the interesting statements which Tholuck makes, p. 580 ff., on the assertion of the Lutheran theologians of the seventeenth century, as well as of their latest companions in adherence to the letter, that this text (and the article of the general call) forces us to accept the position that the gospel had been preached in all the world at Paul's time.

13. We must be careful to distinguish, that the question here is the necessity of the official bearers or messengers of God's word, but not of them exclusively. Or, more strictly speaking, the sending has two sides, and does not consist simply in official arrangements and forms. [This is even more apparent, if we understand ver. 17 to refer to *what is heard*, rather than *what is preached*, and then consider how the Apostle proves from an Old Testament description of the voice of God in nature (ver. 18), the universality of this privilege.—R.]

14. The feet of the messengers on the mountains, or the beauty of the progressive course of the gospel.

15. Unbelief in the gospel is disobedience, specific disobedience and rage; Ps. ii. The more grossly and roughly human nature is apprehended, the more external become the ideas of obedience and disobedience; the more profoundly, purely, and inwardly they are viewed, the more profoundly, purely, and inwardly is this antithesis defined; and, finally and fundamentally, faith in God's word is specific obedience, while unbelief is specific disobedience, specific rebellion. [The LXX. form of Isa. lxv. 2 (ver. 21), by dividing the idea of rebellion into *disobedience* and *gainsaying*, only recognizes the connection between refusing God's commands and contradicting His words: disobedience and unbelief, acting and reacting upon each other continually.—R.]

16. The prudent advance of the Apostle in his judgment, that Israel has changed its part with the Gentiles by its unbelief, and has become an apostate people, is here a characteristic of his masterly apostolic wisdom of instruction, as well as of his apostolic heart, as, with a shudder of inmost sorrow, he gradually draws aside the curtain from the ghastly picture of Israel. The argument from the Old Testament is in conformity with the law that every apology must be discussed from the acknowledged sources, statements, or principles of the opponent, and that its possibility ceases where there cease to be positions in common.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

a. Vers. 1, 2. The benevolent disposition of the Apostle toward Israel. It is clear: 1. From his wish and prayer that they might be saved; 2. From his record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge.—A zeal for God is good, but it should not exist without knowledge (ver. 2). —How often ignorant zeal occurs: 1. In domestic; 2. In civil; and 3. In ecclesiastical affairs; and, unfortunately, it occurs most frequently in the last (ver. 2).—The folly of ignorant zeal. It is foolish: 1. In regard to its starting-point; 2. Its end; 3. The choice of means (ver 2).—Wise and ignorant zeal.

Starke: Oh, how can men so transgress as to be led by a blind religious zeal to oppose the dearest truths of the gospel by an imaginary defence of orthodoxy; and thus hate, calumniate, and reproach Christ in His members, and always think, with those ancient enemies, that, by so doing, they do God service (John xvi. 2).—Hedinger: The zeal of the Jews crucified Christ.

Spener: All the persecutions which have been, and still will be inflicted on pious Christians, are committed by those who do not know the truth and doctrine of godliness; who regard others who are attached to it as false and wicked people; and who think that they render God a service when they persecute them (John xvi. 2); but yet, by this very means, they thrust themselves into God's judgment, and are not at all excused for their error (ver. 2).

Heubner: What is blind zeal in religious matters? Whence does it come? If it be wholly unclean, it is self-love, selfishness; if it be merely joined with perverse measures, then it arises from a weakness of understanding, and, in that case, has also a mixture of *egotism!* True zeal is pure and clear.—Compare Paul's early Jewish and later Christian zeal.

Besser: When Paul cherishes, and expresses in *praying to God*, the hearty wish that they who have stumbled against the stone of offence may yet be *saved*, he certainly has no knowledge of any absolute decree of condemnation on any man, not even on the most stiff-necked Jews (ver. 1).—One of our older teachers laments: "The Jews had, and still have, a zeal without knowledge; but we, alas, have an understanding without zeal" (ver. 2).

b. Ver. 3. Our own righteousness, and righteousness which is of God (Luke xviii. 9-14). 1. The former is proud, and leads to humiliation; 2. The latter, on the contrary, is humble, and leads to exaltation.

Starke, Lange: No persons are farther from God's kingdom, and more difficult to be converted, than those who, when they hear of the method of salvation, have so much of their own righteousness as to think that they have long conformed to it.

Heubner: They are therefore devoid of an humble recognition of their unworthiness before God, they would themselves be *something*, and carry weight. Where this pride and fancy exist, there is always blindness.

c. Vers. 4-11. The righteousness which is of faith is: 1. A righteousness in Christ, who is the end of the law; 2. And therefore can be obtained only by faith in Him (vers. 4-11).—The unbeliever asserts that Christ is far from and unapproachable by man; but the believer, on the contrary, knows that He is near us by the word of faith (vers. 5-9) —In order to avoid believing, men make use of empty evasions (vers. 5-9).—As the law was near to Israel, so is the gospel near to us: 1. In the mouth; 2. In the heart (ver. 8).—What do we preach? 1. Not a remote, and therefore incomprehensible word; but, 2. A near, and therefore a very easily understood word (ver. 8).—The conditions of salvation: 1. The confession of the mouth that Jesus is the Lord; 2. The belief in the heart that God has raised Him from the dead (vers. 9-11).—The inward interdependence of confession and faith: 1. There is no true confession of the mouth without faith in the heart; 2. But there is also no living faith of the heart without the confession of the mouth (vers. 9-11).—Faith in the heart must ever precede the confession of the mouth; which, unfortunately, is not always the case, and therefore so much is said

of confession, and so little is inwardly believed (vers. 9–11).—The great confession of the Christian Church, as expressed: 1. In the apostolic confession of faith; 2. In the hymns of the church; 3. In its prayers; 4. In its celebration of the Lord's Supper (ver. 10). —The confessors of the Christian Church: 1. In the beginning (the time of the first persecutions); 2. In the period of the Reformation; 3. At the present time (the martyrs in Madagascar, on the South Sea Islands, in Borneo, Syria, &c.; ver. 10).

LUTHER: He who does not believe that Christ has died, and risen, in order to make us righteous from our sins, says: "Who shall ascend into heaven, and who shall descend into the deep?" But this is done by those who would be justified by works, and not by faith, when they speak thus with the mouth, but not in the heart. *Emphasis est in verbo:* in the heart.

STARKE: Christ is the essence of the Old Testament Scriptures also; he little understands them who does not find Christ in them. The entire life of the saints of the Old Testament is a prophecy of Christ; John v. 46 (ver. 5).—Say not, "Who has been among the dead, and has returned again, and has told us of the condition of the dead?" Stand by the gospel truth, and you will be righteous and saved; Luke xvi. 31 (ver. 7).—Be comforted, troubled soul; though you do not have the joy of faith just in the hour of temptation, you will nevertheless be saved, so long as you depend on Christ; for God, who does not lie, has often given you the assurance that you shall be saved (ver. 11).—CRAMER: The mouth and the heart cannot be separated; Ps. cxvi. 10 (ver. 9).—Faith must not grow on the tongue, but in the heart; Acts xv. 9 (ver. 10).—HEDINGER: The heart without the mouth is timidity; the mouth without the heart is hypocrisy (ver. 10).

SPENER: We read that the word is nigh us, namely, that it is declared to us; that we have it in the *heart*—where the Holy Spirit has impressed it; and in the *mouth*, by which we declare it. Therefore, it is not something concealed in heaven, or in the deep, but we have it with us, and in us. Verily, we may say that the *word* means not only the word itself, but also the blessings which that word presents—Christ, with all His gospel treasures. Christ's merit, grace, Spirit, and life are not far from us, and cannot first be brought down from heaven, or brought up from the deep; they are not first to be acquired, but are nigh us, and, if we will accept them, in the mouth and in the heart. Thus, though the language of the Old Testament was not *on this wise*, since the knowledge of grace was of a less degree, more obscure, and more difficult to be obtained, yet it is now very near to us, for it is imparted by the greater and stronger measure of grace which is now declared to us (ver. 8).

GERLACH: Christ is in so far the end of the law as He, 1. Is its final object, the one to whom it leads (Gal. iii. 24); 2. Is its fulfilment (Matt. v. 17); 3. Puts an end to the dominion of the law (Luke xvi. 16) (ver. 4).—To become acquainted with God's gracious counsel, to deprive death of its power by the manifestation of a divine and holy life in the flesh—which the carnal man was incapable of, since he knew nothing except the righteousness which is of the law—can be effected by the righteousness which is of faith, which establishes him in Christ's right, and freely gives him as his own what the Son of God is and has. The heart need only believe, and the mouth only confess in order to be righteous and saved (vers. 8–11).

LISCO: The Divine order of salvation is, therefore: Justification succeeds faith, God's assistance is obtained, and he who courageously and perseveringly confesses his faith, obtains salvation (ver. 10) —HEUBNER: Righteousness is introduced as speaking, and is regarded as proffering itself. No superhuman knowledge, or profound learning, or ascending to heaven to see Christ, is necessary to convince us of Christ's resurrection and His sitting at God's right hand; neither is it necessary to descend into the kingdom of the dead, to ask whether Christ is with the dead, or risen? In short, no view of the history of Jesus Christ himself, and no laborious and learned research, are necessary for us to believe. Faith is an affair of the heart. No one can, therefore, excuse his unbelief on the ground of the difficulty or impossibility of faith (vers. 6, 7).—Paul brings out prominently the faith of the heart against hypocrites and lip-Christians; and against the faint-hearted and desponding confession—that is, the expression, the demonstration of Christianity by word and deed (vers. 9–11).

BESSER: Faith and confession are related to each other as essence and manifestation, as light and rays as fire and flame. . . . Salvation is the manifestation, the present and finite revelation of righteousness; and righteousness is salvation under cover, though the covering is transparent and fragrant, just as Christ is concealed in prophecy, and the enduring tabernacle of God in the Church on earth (ver. 10).

d. Vers. 12–17. The gospel as a saving message for all, Jews as well as Greeks: 1. It is preached to all; but, 2. It is not believed by all (vers. 12–17). —There is no difference in nations before the one Lord, who is rich unto all that call upon Him; but whosoever calleth upon Him shall be saved (vers 12, 13).—How the calling upon the true God—who is perfectly revealed in Christ—and faith and preaching, are connected (vers. 13–16).—"Lord, who hath believed our report?" Thus Isaiah once lamented, and thus we, too, lament frequently; but we can only do it when we are conscious that we have performed our ministerial duty to the best of our knowledge and conscience; that is, if our sermons have proceeded: 1. From thoroughly searching into the Holy Scriptures; 2. From hearty prayer; 3. From a full acquaintance with the necessities of our congregations (ver. 16).—Christian preaching: 1. What does it effect? Faith. 2. By what means does it come? By the word of God (ver. 17).—Preaching stands midway between faith and God's word. 1. It *produces* the former; 2. It draws *its supplies* from the latter (ver. 17).—The appealing power of preaching (ver. 17).

STARKE: All kinds of people can have free access to God, and so pray that their petitions may be answered (ver. 12).—HEDINGER: Oh, if a man would be saved, how much depends on hearing, teaching, and calling! A beautiful chain; but what is wanting in it? Hearing is defective; proper and thorough preaching is wanting; and many thousands are needed for preaching. Dreadful harm thereby ensues, &c. (ver. 14).—CRAMER: The world ever remains the same—as in Isaiah's day, so at the time of Christ and the Apostles, and even at this very hour. What a pity that the old lamentation must still be repeated! (ver. 16.)—LANGE: Preacher, see that your discourses be delivered in simplicity and Divine power

and hearer, see that your attention is of the right kind (ver. 17).

SPENER: 1. They must *call upon* Christ if they would be saved; 2. But if they would call upon Him, they must *believe* on Him; 3. If they would believe on Him, they must *hear* His word; 4. But if they would hear His word, it must be *preached* to them; 5. But if they would have preachers, people must be *sent* to them for that purpose. These are the successive links in the chain of Divine beneficence (ver. 14).—ROOS: Here, as was always the case with the Apostle in his charges against the Jews, he cites passages from the Old Testament Scriptures; the *first* of which is Isa. xxviii. 16, where the "making waste" has the same force as "being ashamed." . . . The *second* passage is in Joel ii. 32, and comes down lowest to the weakness of men. Our advice to the greatest sinner who stands on the brink of hell is: "Call upon the name of the Lord, and thou shalt be saved." . . . The *third* passage is in Isa. lii. 7, and is a prophecy of the friendly and beautiful heralds whom the Lord, having previously spoken himself, would send out at the time of the New Testament, in order to preach peace and good-will to men. But why? Undoubtedly in order that men might lay hold of the peace declared to them, and appropriate and enjoy God's good-will toward them. But because this should take place by faith, these heralds lament, in the fourth passage, Isa. liii. 1: "Lord, who hath believed our report?" (vers. 11–16.)—BENGEL: Any man is worth more than the whole world.

GERLACH: God wills the salvation of all, but all do not wish the salvation of God; unbelief is the cause of the ruin of all who are lost (ver. 16).—It is God's will that all should believe; and for this reason He has sent preaching, whose import is His own word (ver. 17).

LISCO: It is Christian duty to send teachers to the heathen world; missions are necessary, and according to the Lord's will (Mark xvi. 15); and it is a glorious calling, to declare the message of Jesus, deliverance of the captives, and the new kingdom of God.—Preaching takes place by God's word; that is, by virtue of the Divine call and a doctrine revealed by God (ver. 17).

HEUBNER: Living preaching is God's chosen means of instruction (ver. 14).—*God* must send preachers; they cannot go of themselves (ver. 15).—All the effects of grace are connected with the word; this applies to fanatics, enthusiasts, and those who despise the word and preaching (ver. 17).

BESSER: The Divine order of salvation admits of no personal or national distinction (ver. 12).—The help of the rich Lord, as He passes by, is invited by *calling upon* Him, though it be not with strong faith, yet with a hearty desire to believe; by *calling upon* Him, though we do not pray as we ought, yet are supported by the unutterable groans of the Spirit (chap. viii. 26); by *calling upon* Him, if not with advanced knowledge, yet with the loud confession of Bartimeus: "Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me!" (Mark x. 47) (ver. 12.)—BENGEL says: "He who desires the end, will also contribute the means. God desires that all men call upon Him for salvation.; therefore He wishes them to believe; therefore, to hear; and, therefore, to have preachers. Hence He has sent preachers. He has done every thing necessary for our salvation. His antecedent gracious will is universal, and is clothed with energetic power" (ver. 14).—It is not only necessary for the real preacher in God's name that the word preached be real, but also that the preacher say: "Here is the staff in my hand; the Lord has sent me" (ver. 15).

e. Vers. 18–21. The relation of the Jews and Gentiles to the preaching of the gospel: 1. The former did not *wish* to understand the gospel, although they *could* understand it; 2. But the latter although they were ignorant, have understood it, because they wished to do so.—*The conclusion of the whole chapter:* The Jews are themselves guilty of their wretched fate, which took such a lively hold upon the Apostle's sympathy. For, A. The gospel was: 1. Not far from them; 2. It was preached to them; 3. They could lay hold of it; but, B. *They—the Jews*—sought it; 1. Far off; 2. Did not like to hear it; 3. Would not understand it.

STARKE: Who will blame God that so many people remain children of Satan, and are condemned? Behold, they are themselves the cause (ver. 21).—ROOS, with reference to chaps. ix. and x.: From all this it is plain that the word *grace* is the most comforting and most severe, the clearest and the darkest word in the Bible. It is the most comforting word, because it assures salvation to the creature (to whom his Creator is in nowise indebted), the sinner who deserves punishment. It is also the most severe word, because it utterly prostrates pride, slays defiance, and completely destroys the notion of self-righteousness, which is so natural to man. It is the clearest word, because it needs no description; but it is also the darkest word, because its simple meaning is understood by only a few humble souls. Many men, who think that they understand this word, conceive God's grace very much as a prince's favor, which always has regard to service, and is never disconnected from utility. But God needs no service. His will alone is free. No one can recompense Him. And yet He is righteous, and acts according to knowledge. Whoso is wise, and he shall understand these things? Prudent, and he shall know them?

HEUBNER, on Ps. xix.: The gospel and creation are God's two voices that reëcho about us.

BESSER: Quotation of an expression of Luther who compares preaching to a stone thrown into the water. The circles ever enlarge, but the water in the middle is still.

LANGE: The intercession of Paul, who was persecuted by the Jews, for Israel.—His witness for Israel: 1. High praise; 2. Great censure.—The different forms of self-righteousness.—Self-righteousness is always opposed to God's righteousness, which is: 1. Legislative; 2. Penal; 3. Merciful, justifying; 4. Awakening to new life.—The self-testimony of the law and the gospel to the inward nature of man: 1. The law, the ideal of his life; 2. The gospel, the life of his ideal.—The twin form, faith, and confession: 1. Is positively different; yet, 2. Inseparable.—The riches of the Lord to praying hearts—to the praying, sinful world.—The universality of the gospel.—The freedom and limitation of the message of salvation: 1. It is free to all in the world who call upon the Lord; 2. It is confined to faith, because unbelief contradicts it.

[BURKITT (condensed): Christ is the end of the law: 1. As He is the scope of it; 2. As He is the accomplishment of it; 3. As He is to the believer what the law would have been to him if he could have perfectly kept it—namely, righteousness and life, justification and salvation.—The natural man is a proud man: he likes to live upon his own stock

he cannot stoop to a sincere and universal renunciation of his own righteousness, and to depend wholly upon the righteousness of another. It is natural to a man to choose rather to eat a brown crust, or wear a coarse garment, which he can call his own, than to feed upon the richest dainties, or wear the costliest robes, which he must receive as an alms from another.—DODDRIDGE: Let us rejoice in the spread which the gospel has already had, and let us earnestly and daily pray that the voices of those Divine messengers that proclaim it may go forth unto all the earth, and their words reach, in a literal sense, to the remotest ends of the globe.—Lord, give us any plague rather than the plague of the heart!—SCOTT: Ministers who are faithful bear the most affectionate good-will to those from whom they receive the greatest injuries; and they offer fervent and persevering prayers for the salvation of the very persons against whom they denounce the wrath of God if they persist in unbelief.—CLARKE: Salvation only by righteousness: 1. The righteousness or justification which is by faith, receives Christ as an atoning sacrifice, by which all sin is pardoned; 2. It receives continual supplies of grace from Christ by the eternal Spirit, through which man is enabled to love God with all his heart, soul, mind, and strength, and his neighbor as himself; 3. This grace is afforded in sufficient degrees, suited to all places, times, and circumstances, so that no trial can happen too great to be borne, as the grace of Christ is ever at hand to support and save to the uttermost.—HODGE: It is the first and most pressing duty of the Church to cause all men to hear the gospel. The solemn question, "How can they believe without a preacher?" should sound day and night in the ears of the churches. The gospel's want of success, or the fact that few believe our report, is only a reason for its wider extension. The more who hear, the more will be saved, even should it be but a small proportion of the whole.—J. F. H.]

THIRD SECTION.—*The final gracious solution of the enigma, or the overruling of judgment for the salvation of Israel. God's judgment on Israel is not one of reprobation. God's saving economy in His Providence over Jews and Gentiles, over the election and the great majority of Israel, and over the concatenation of judgment and salvation, by virtue of which all Israel shall finally attain to faith and salvation through the fulness of the Gentiles. The universality of judgment and mercy. Doxology.*

CHAP. XI. 1–36.

A.

1 I say then, Hath [Did] God cast away his people? God forbid. [Let it not
be!] For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, *of* the tribe of
2 Benjamin. God hath [did] not cast away his people which he foreknew.
Wot [Or know] ye not what the Scripture saith of Elias [ἐν Ἡλίᾳ, in the story
of Elijah]? how he maketh intercession to [pleadeth with] God against Israel.
3 saying [*omit* saying],[1] Lord,[2] they have killed thy prophets, and [*omit* and;
insert they have][3] digged down thine altars; and I am left alone [the only one],[4]
4 and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God [the divine response]
unto him? I have reserved[5] to myself seven thousand men, who have
not [who never] bowed the knee to *the image of* [*omit the image of*] Baal.
5 Even so then at [ἐν, in] this present time also there is a remnant according to
6 the election of grace. And [Now] if by grace, then *is it* no more [no longer]
of works: otherwise[6] grace is no more [no longer becomes] grace. But[7] if
it be of works, then is[8] it no more [longer] grace: otherwise work is no more
[longer] work.[9]

B.

7 What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for [That which
Israel seeketh for, he obtained not]; but the election hath [*omit* hath] obtained
8 it, and the rest were blinded [hardened], ([*omit parenthesis*] According as it is
written, God[10] hath given [gave] them the [a] spirit of slumber [*or*, stupor],
eyes[11] that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto
9 [not hear, unto] this day. And David saith,

Let[12] their table be made [become] a snare, and a trap,
And a stumbling-block, and a recompense unto them:
10 Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see,
And bow down their back alway.[13]

C.

11 I say then, Have they stumbled that [Did they stumble in order that] they
should fall? God forbid: [Let it not be!] but *rather* through [but by] their
fall salvation *is come* unto the Gentiles, for to provoke [in order to excite]
12 them to jealousy [*or*, emulation]. Now if the fall of them [their fall] *be* the
riches of the world, and the diminishing of them [their diminishing] the riches
13 of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness? For[14] I speak [I am speak
ing] to you Gentiles [:], inasmuch [then][15] as I am the apostle of the Gentiles,
14 I magnify [glorify] mine office: If by any means I may provoke [excite] to
emulation *them which are* [*omit them which are*] my [own] flesh, and might save
15 some of them. For if the casting away of them *be* the reconciling [reconcilia-
tion] of the world, what *shall* the receiving [reception] *of them be*, but life
16 from the dead. For [Moreover] if the first-fruit *be* holy, the lump *is* also *holy*
[so also is the lump]: and if the root *be* holy, so *are* the branches [also].

D.

17 And [But] if some of the branches be [were] broken off, and thou, being
a wild olive tree, wert graffed [grafted] in among them, and with them par-
takest [and *made* fellow-partaker] of the root and[16] fatness of the olive tree;
18 Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root,
19 but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, The[17] branches were broken off, that I
20 might be graffed [grafted] in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken
21 off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded,[18] but fear: For if God
spared not the natural branches, *take heed* [*fear*] lest[19] he also spare not thee.
22 Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which [those
who] fell, severity;[20] but toward thee, goodness [God's goodness],[21] if thou
23 continue in *his* goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. And they also
[moreover], if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be graffed [grafted] in: for
24 God is able to graff [graft] them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the
olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert graffed [grafted] contrary to
nature into a good olive tree; how much more shall these, which be the natural
branches, be graffed [grafted] into their own olive tree?

E.

25 For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest
ye should be wise in your own conceits,[22] that blindness [hardening] in part is
26 happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be [*omit* be] come in. And
so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written,[23] There shall come out of Sion the
27 Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: For this *is* my cove-
nant [the covenant from me, παρ' ἐμοῦ] unto them, when I shall take away their
28 sins. As concerning [touching][24] the gospel, *they are* enemies for your sakes:
29 but as touching the election, *they are* beloved for the fathers' sakes. For the
30 gifts and calling of God *are* without repentance. For as[25] ye in times past
have not believed [were disobedient to][26] God, yet have now obtained mercy
31 through their unbelief [the disobedience of these]: Even so have these also
now not believed, that through your mercy [*i. e., mercy shown to you*] they also may
32 obtain mercy. For God hath concluded them all [shut up[27] all] in unbelief
[disobedience], that [in order that] he might [may] have mercy upon all.
33 O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom [riches and wisdom] and knowl-
edge of God! how unsearchable[28] *are* his judgments, and his ways past finding
34 out! For who hath[29] known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his
35 counsellor? Or[30] who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto
36 him again? For of him, and through him, and to [unto] him, *are* all things:
to whom [him] *be* glory for ever. Amen.

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 2.—[The *Rec.* inserts λέγων; supported by א[1]. L. It is omitted in א[3]. A. B. C. D. F., versions and fathers. The probability of an interpolation is so great, that modern editors unhesitatingly reject it.—Some MSS. insert ὃν προέγνω (from the first clause of ver. 2) in the first clause of ver. 1. The similiarity of the clauses readily explains this.

[2] Ver. 3.—[A free citation from the LXX., 3 (1.) Kings xix. 10 (ver. 14 is almost a repetition of ver. 10): τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν (ver. 14: καθεῖλαν), καὶ τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, καὶ ὑπολέλειμμαι ἐγὼ μονώτατος, καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχήν μου λαβεῖν αὐτήν. The Apostle has omitted a few unimportant words, transposed the clauses, substituted μόνος for μονώτατος, and the aorist ὑπελείφθην for the perfect. The LXX. follows the Hebrew closely.

[3] Ver. 3.—[Καί (*Rec.* א[3]. D. L.) is omitted in א[1]. A. B. C. F., by recent editors. The vivacious form of the Greek is restored by the above emendation. So Noyes, Alford, Five Ang. Clergymen, and Dr. Lange in his German text. "Lord, they have killed thy prophets, they have digged down thine altars."

[4] Ver. 3.—[Five Ang. Clergymen: *I only am left*. The above emendation is more strictly literal, although it would answer still better to the μονώτατος of the LXX.

[5] Ver. 4.—[From 1 Kings xix. 18, but varying from both the Hebrew and the LXX.; not materially, however. The LXX. reads: καὶ καταλείψεις (complut. ed., καταλείψω) ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ἑπτὰ χιλιάδας ἀνδρῶν, πάντα γόνατα ἃ οὐκ ὤκλασαν γόνυ τῷ Βάαλ. Alford: "The Apostle here corrects a mistake of the LXX., who have, for κατέλιπον, καταλείψεις. He has added to the Hebrew, הִשְׁאַרְתִּי,—'*I have left*,' '*kept as a remainder*,'—ἐμαυτῷ, a simple and obvious filling up of the sense.—On τῇ Βάαλ, instead of τῷ, see *Exeg. Notes*. The italicised words of the E. V. are omitted, although defended to some extent by Dr. Lange, who supplies, in his German text: [*der Säule*—מַצֵּבָה—*d s*] It seems unnecessary to insert a *comment* of such doubtful correctness.

[6] Ver. 6.—[*Otherwise* is sufficiently correct, although ἐπεί, literally, means: *since in that case*.—Γίνεται, which has been altered in one MS., and taken as = ἐστί, in most versions, is to be rendered exactly. On the meaning, see *Exeg. Notes*. The simplest view is: *ceaseth to be*; but Dr. Lange finds more in the expression.

[7] Ver. 6.—[The whole clause: εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων. . . . ἐστὶν ἔργον, is omitted in א[1]. A. C. D. F., versions and fathers; it is rejected by Erasmus, Grotius, Wetstein, Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Meyer, Tregelles; bracketted by Alford, and in version of Amer. Bible Union (rejected by Five Ang. Clergymen). On the other hand, it is found (with some variations noticed in the following notes) in א[3]. B. L., the older versions, in Chrysostom and Theodoret (text. not commentary). It is retained by Beza, Bengel, Rinck, Fritzsche, Reiche, Tholuck, by Tischendorf in later editions, Wordsworth, Hodge, Lange. It is difficult to decide, but the critical ground for retaining it is very strong. See *Exeg. Notes*.

[8] Ver. 6.—[*Rec.*: ἐστί, on very slight authority.

[9] Ver. 6.—[B. has χάρις for ἔργον; either a mistake of the transcriber, or an attempt at explanation. See *Exeg. Notes*.

[10] Ver. 8.—[The first clause is a free citation from Isa. xxix. 10. LXX: ὅτι πεπότικεν ὑμᾶς κύριος πνεύματι κατανύξεως. Hebrew: כִּי־נָסַךְ עֲלֵיכֶם יְהוָה רוּחַ תַּרְדֵּמָה.

[11] Ver. 8.—[It is much disputed whether these words are borrowed from Deut. xxix. 4, or from Isa. vi. 9. The former passage reads thus (LXX.): καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκε . . . καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς βλέπειν, καὶ ὦτα ἀκούειν ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης. The latter contains the same idea, but still further removed in form from Paul's language. Dr. Lange thinks both were in mind. In that case, as well as if Deuteronomy is cited, the parentheses must be omitted, so as to join "unto this day" with the rest of the verse. Noyes tones down the telic force thus: "eyes that were not to see, and ears that were not to hear."

[12] Ver. 9.—[From Ps. lxix. 23 (E. V., 22). The LXX. is followed more closely than the Hebrew text. The latter is literally: "Let their table before them be for a snare, and to those secure (לִשְׁלוֹמִים), a trap." (The E. V. *in loco*, gives an unnecessarily forced and circuitous rendering.) The LXX. renders: γενηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα, καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδοσιν, καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον. The Apostle follows the first clause quite closely, then inserts εἰς θήραν, and putting σκάνδαλον next, substitutes ἀνταπόδομα for the LXX. equivalent. The main difficulty is with the expression last named. The Hebrew word, according to the present pointing (given above), does not mean *requitals, recompense*; "although this sense may be deduced from the verbal root (שָׁלַם), and belongs to several collateral derivatives, it has no existence in the usage of the one before us" (J. A. Alexander). The usual explanation is, that the LXX. pointed the word thus, לְשִׁלֻּמִים; *for retributions*, and the Apostle, finding this meaning in keeping with the spirit of the original, adopted it in the varied form of the text.

[13] Ver. 10.—[The LXX. version of Ps. lxix. 24 (23) is followed with great exactness. But it varies from the Hebrew text (מָתְנֵיהֶם תָּמִיד הַמְעַד, *make their loins to waver*, or *tremble*) in the last clause. The meaning is preserved, however. See *Exeg. Notes*.

[14] Ver. 13.—[The *Rec.* D. F. L., fathers, read γάρ; א, A. B., versions, δέ. Lange adopts the former, mainly on exegetical grounds; Lachmann, Alford, Tregelles, the latter. C. has οὖν; hence Meyer thinks it impossible to decide which is the genuine particle; nor is it of importance.

[15] Ver. 13.—[In *Rec.*, L., some versions and fathers, οὖν is omitted; in D. F., μὲν οὖν; both are found in א. A. B. C. De Wette and Tholuck reject both, on exegetical grounds; most critical editors retain μέν, and Meyer accounts for οὖν as inserted because the corresponding δέ was wanting. On the whole, it is safest to retain both, with Lachmann and Alford. Tregelles brackets οὖν.

[16] Ver. 17.—[The καί (*Rec.*) is omitted in א[1]. B. C., but found in א[3]. A. L. Still another reading in D[1]. F. Alford rejects, Tregelles brackets, but most editors retain it. If retained, the note of Dr. Lange *in loco* is correct.—The E. V. has paraphrased συγκοινωνός: *with them partakest*. The above emendation is more literal.

[17] Ver. 19.—[The article οἱ before κλάδοι is omitted in א. A. C. D[3]. L.; rejected by Scholz, Lachmann, Meyer, Wordsworth (who incorrectly cites B. as omitting it), Tregelles; bracketted by Alford. It is found in B. D[1].; retained by Tischendorf, De Wette, Tholuck, Lange. Meyer thinks it is a mechanical repetition from vers. 17, 18; while De Wette thinks it was omitted on account of the euphony: ἐξεκλάσθησαν κλάδοι. In any case, the reference is to the branches broken off.

[18] Ver. 20.—[Instead of ὑψηλοφρόνει (*Rec.*, C. D. F. G.), Lachmann and Tregelles adopt ὑψηλὰ φρόνει, on the authority of א. A. B. The first word is so unusual that it was likely to be changed. Most editors follow the *Rec.*

[19] Ver. 21.—[The uncial authority is against μήπως. It is omitted in א. A. B. C., but found in D. F. L. It is rejected by Lachmann and Tregelles, bracketted by Alford. But the probability of an omission, because of the future (φείσεται) which follows, is so great, that most critical editors retain it. To obviate the same difficulty, the subj. φείσηται is substituted in *Rec.*, but with no uncial support.

[20] Ver. 22.—[Instead of the accusative ἀποτομίαν (*Rec.*, D. F. L.) most editors adopt the nominative, on the authority of א[1]. A. B. C. The punctuation favors the latter, as the former would be governed by ἴδε, which is separated from it by a colon. The absence of a predicate for the nominatives led to the change. So Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, De Wette, Tregelles, Lange. The same remarks apply to χρηστότης.

[21] Ver. 22.—[Instead of χρηστότητα (*Rec.*, D[3]. F. L.), χρηστότης on the authority of A. B. C. D[1]. . . . χρηστότητος.—*Rec.*, D[3] [3]. F. L. omit θεοῦ, which is found in א. A. B. C. D[1]. The critical editors generally adopt it, on the ground that it was likely to have been omitted as unnecessary. The later revisions retain and render as above, except Amer. Bible Union, which follows the E. V.

[22] Ver. 25.—[*Rec.*, with א. C. D, L., reads παρ' ἑαυτοῖς. A. B. have ἐν. The preposition is omitted in F. and some cursives. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Hodge, Tregelles, adopt ἐν; but the sense is much the same, whichever

preposition be adopted. The phrase παρ' ἑαυτοῖς is found in chap. xii. 16, and Prov. iii. 7 (LXX.); hence the probability of an alteration to correspond.

[23] Ver. 26.—[According to the view of most of the best expositors, the citation is from Isa. lix. 20, 21 (from Ἥξει to διαθήκη, ver. 27); the last clause of ver. 27 is from Isa. xxvii. 9. The text of the LXX., and the more important variations from the Hebrew, will be found in the *Exeg. Notes*.

[24] Ver. 28.—[Κατά, *according to, as respects*, &c. The version of Five Ang. Clergymen adopts *as touching*, in both clauses; Amer. Bible Union: *as concerning*. If a choice must be made between the two, the former is preferable although neither is altogether exact.

[25] Ver. 30.—[The *Rec.* inserts καί, on the authority of א³. L., and some versions. It is omitted in א corr [1] A. B. C D[1]., versions and fathers; rejected by modern editors generally. Scholz retains it.

[26] Ver. 30.—[The E. V. confounds here the nearly related ideas of *unbelief* and *disobedience*. Later revisions correct the rendering of both verb and noun. Dr. Hodge claims that the E. V. is correct; but it is only inferentially so. These remarks apply also to ἀπείθειαν (ver. 32).

[27] Ver. 32.—[*Concluded*, was once a literal rendering of συνέκλεισεν; *included* (Amer. Bible Union), while it expresses a part of the meaning, is not strong enough; *delivered up* (Noyes), is an interpretation rather than a translation. It seems best, then, to substitute the simple, literal Saxon: *shut up*. So E. V., Gal. iii. 23, though *concluded* is found in ver. 22.—Instead of the masculine τοὺς πάντας, we find τὰ πάντα, and παντα (so Vulg.), but very weakly supported.

[28] Ver. 33.—[Both ἀνεξεραύνητα and ἀνεξερευνητα are found. The former is supported by א. A. B[1].; adopted by Alford, Tregelles (Meyer, De Wette, adopt the latter).

[29] Ver. 34.—[The aorists of vers. 34 and 35 are rendered by simple past tenses in the Amer. Bible Union, at the expense both of rhythm and strict adherence to the sense of the Hebrew at least.—The LXX. (Isa. xl. 13) is followed very closely.

[30] Ver. 36.—[" From Job xli. 3 (11, E. V.), where the LXX. (xli. 2) have τίς ἀντιστήσεταί μοι, κ. ὑπομενεῖ; But the Hebrew is מִי הִקְדִּימַנִי וַאֲשַׁלֵּם, '*who hath anticipated* (*i. e.*, by the context, *conferred a benefit*) *on me, that I may repay him?*' And to this the Apostle alludes, using the third person " (Alford).—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary.—A. Israel is not rejected; the kernel of it—the election—is saved; vers. 1–6. B. The great proportion of Israel, all except the essentially important remnant, the " rest," are hardened, as was described by the Spirit in the Old Testament beforehand; but its hardness has become a condition for the conversion of the Gentiles; vers. 7–11.* C. Yet, on the other hand, the conversion of the Gentiles is in turn a means for the conversion of Israel, and thereby for the revivification of the world. The saving effect of their rejection gives ground for expecting a still more saving effect of their reception. The significance of the first-fruits and of the root; vers. 12–16. D. The very fact that the Gentiles believe, and the Jews do not believe, is largely conditional. Gentiles, as individuals, can become unbelievers; and Jews, as individuals, can become believers. For: *a.* The Gentiles are grafted on the stem of the Jewish theocracy among believing Jews. *b.* They can just as readily be cut off by unbelief, as the Jews can be grafted in by faith, because the latter have a greater historical relationship with the kingdom of God; vers. 17–24. E. The last word, or the mystery of Divine Providence in the economy of salvation. Every thing will redound to the glory of God. God's saving economy for the world: The unbelieving Gentiles have been converted by believing Israel; unbelieving Israel shall be converted by believing Gentiles. The judgment on all, that mercy might be shown to all. Praise offered to God for His plan of salvation, for its execution, for its end, and for its ground; vers. 25–36. [Dr. Hodge divides the chapter into two parts: vers. 1–10 and 11–36. (1.) The rejection of the Jews was not *total*. A remnant (and a larger one than many might suppose) remained, though the mass was rejected. (2.) This rejection is not *final*. The restoration of the Jews is a desirable and probable event; vers. 11–24. It is one which God has determined to bring about; vers. 25–32. A sublime declaration of the unsearchable wisdom of God, manifested in all His dealings with men; vers. 33–36. So Forbes.—R.]

* [Dr. Lange divides the text so as to include only vers. 1–10 in this paragraph, which is the usual division; but here, and in the exegesis, he adds ver. 11.—R.]

Vers. 1–6: *Israel is not rejected. The real kernel of it is already saved.*

Ver. 1. **I say then** [Λέγω οὖν]. The οὖν may appear to be merely an inference from what was said last: *All* day long God stretched forth His hand. But as, in ver. 11, he makes a further assertion, designed to forestall a false conclusion, it has here the same meaning, in antithesis to the strong judgment pronounced on Israel at the conclusion of the previous chapter. Meyer maintains a more definite reference to the λέγω in vers. 10, 18, 19.

[**Did God cast away his people?** μὴ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; When Reiche remarks the absence of an ἅπαντα from λαόν, and Semler an *omnino* from ἀπώσατο, they both fail to appreciate the emphasis of the expressions. *The* people and *his* people are different ones, just as an *economic giving over to judgment* and an *eonic casting away* (Ps. xciv. 14; xcv. 7). Bengel: *Ipsa populi ejus appellatio rationem negandi continet.* The Apostle repels such a thought with religious horror: μὴ γένοιτο.

For I also [καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ]. According to the usual acceptation, he adduces his own call as an example; but Meyer, with De Wette and Baumgarten-Crusius, on the contrary, hold that Paul, on account of his patriotic sense as a true Israelite, could not concede that casting away.* But it was just this inference from a feeling of national patriotism that was the standpoint of his opponents. A single example, it is said, can prove nothing. But by Paul's using the καί, he refers to the other examples which were numerously represented by the Jewish Christians among his readers.

Am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin [Ἰσραηλίτης εἰμί, ἐκ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, φυλῆς Βενιαμείν. The spelling Βενιαμίν (LXX., *Rec.*) is poorly supported here and in Phil. iii. 5.] As a true scion of Abraham and Benjamin—the tribe which, together with Judah, constituted the real substance

* [Wordsworth supposes that he is speaking as an Apostle: "Do not imagine (he says to the *Jews*) that God cast off His ancient people when He admitted the Gentiles to the Church. No; I, who am His chosen instrument for admitting them, am a Jew" But this is an inference rather than an interpretation. He also explains "of the tribe of Benjamin:" "the son of Israel by his beloved wife *Rachel*, not by Leah, or by one of their handmaids" —R.]

of the people which returned from the captivity—he is conscious that he does not belong to the election as a mere proselyte; if he would speak of a casting away of God's people, he must therefore deny himself and his faith (Phil. iii. 5). [Alford distinguishes between the popular view, and another which implies, "that if such a hypothesis were to be conceded, it would exclude from God's kingdom the *writer himself*, as an Israelite." This agrees, apparently, with Lange's view, but implies also that "his people" is used in the *national* sense, not of the *spiritual* Israel. See below.—R.]

Ver. 2. **God did not cast away** [οὐκ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεός]. He follows with a solemn declaration founded upon the testimony of his own conscientiousness and of examples.

His people [τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ]. He is as definite in characterizing *His people*, ὃν προέγνω, as he is grand in his declaration of the *not casting away*. On the idea of προγινώσκειν, see chap. viii. 29. Two explanations here come in conflict with each other:

1. The spiritual people of God are spoken of, the Ἰσραὴλ θεοῦ; Rom. ix. 6; Gal. vi. 16 (Origen, Augustine, Luther, Calvin [Hodge], &c.).

2. Meyer says, on the contrary: The subject of the whole chapter is not the spiritual Israel, but the fate of the nation in regard to the salvation effected by the Messiah. Tholuck and Philippi [De Wette, Stuart, Alford], are of the same view. But the idea of "people" which the Apostle presents is so very dynamical, that it might be said: to him the election is the people, and God's true people is an election. This is evidently the thought in chap. ix., and also in vers. 4 and 5 of the present chapter. But if we emphasize properly the idea of casting away, the idea of election does not any more stand in antithesis to it; that is, it is not thereby settled that there is an election. But as the defenders of view (1.) mistake the full import of the further elaboration, especially ver. 26, so do the defenders of (2.) pass too lightly over the gradations made by the Apostle. [Against the interpretation: *spiritual people*, it may well be urged, that all along the Apostle has been speaking of the *nation*; that this very chapter treats of the final salvation of Israel as a nation, and Paul says he is an Israelite, &c., of this historical (not spiritual) people. Besides, the Scriptures have suffered very much from assumptions respecting *spiritual* references. The only argument in favor of this meaning is the phrase: "Whom he foreknew." It is held that this defines the people as those referred to in chap. viii. 29 ff.; but may there not be a foreknowledge of a nation resulting in national privileges, such as the Jews enjoyed, as really as foreknowledge of an individual and consequent blessing? The whole current of thought in the chapter—in fact, in chaps. ix.-xi.—is against any such interpretation as shall make "His people" = His spiritual Israel, over against Israel as a nation. If any limitation be made, it should be thus expressed: the real people of God *among the Jewish people*, recognizing them as the pith and kernel of the *nation*, not as isolated individuals from out the mass. This seems to be Dr. Lange's view, and is probably that of many who are quoted in favor of (1) We thus retain the weight of the Apostle's proof: *For I also am an Israelite*, and avoid weakening the main thought of the chapter, which undoubtedly is: *the ultimate national restoration of the Jews*. Were it not this, the whole argument of chaps. ix.-xi. ends with a *non sequitur*. Comp. Alford, *in loco*.—R.]

What is meant by God casting away His people? 1. There is an election of believers, and it is far greater than one of little faith may think. (How many Jews themselves, of all periods, would like to have been friends of Jesus!) 2. The call of the Gentiles is even designed indirectly for the conversion of Israel, and individuals can always be gained. 3. The whole Divine disposition is designed for the final salvation of all Israel. Here, therefore, the thought of the mercy controlling this whole economy, comes in contrast with the thought of the great economical judgment of hardening. If, however, the expression *all Israel* be urged, and there be found in individuals of it an assurance of the salvation of the empirical totality, we would have to be indifferent to the idea of election with reference to Israel as a people, and let it consist in the idea of an absolute restoration.

Which he foreknew [ὃν προέγνω]. This limits the meaning, in so far as the empirical mass of the people is not meant; but, on the other hand, the small empirical number of believing Jews is also not meant, but the people in their whole regal idea and nature. In this eternal destination of Israel God cannot contradict himself. [Alford (so Tholuck, De Wette, Meyer) thus paraphrases: "*which, in His own eternal decree before the world, He selected as the chosen nation, to be His own, the depositary of His law, the vehicle of the theocracy, from its first revelation to Moses, to its completion in Christ's future kingdom.*" Toward this national reference later commentators generally incline. See Hodge, on the other side.—R.]

Or know ye not, &c. [Ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἠλίᾳ, κ.τ.λ. Ἢ introduces a new objection to the matter impugned (Alford). Comp. chap. ix. 21; vi. 3.—R.] Tholuck: "Ἐν Ἠλίᾳ, quotation of the section treating of Elijah, as Mark xii. 26: ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου. Examples from the classics in Fritzsche, to which may be added Thucydides i. 9, and proofs from Philo, in Grossmann," &c. (see 1 Kings xix. 10, 14). Incorrect view: ἐν Ἠλίᾳ, *of Elijah* (Erasmus, Luther [E. V.], and others). [Upon this point all modern commentators and translators agree, though they differ about the proper word to be supplied, whether *section*, *history*, or *story*; the last is simplest.—R.]

Ver. 3. **Lord, they have killed thy prophets**, &c. [Κύριε, τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν, κ.τ.λ. See *Textual Note* [4].] The Apostle has quoted freely the real meaning of the words of the text. It makes no difference in the thing itself that, in the complaint which Elijah makes, he understands by the μόνος* the only remaining prophet, while the present passage understands the only worshipper of God. For the prophet, in his state of mind, was not inclined to acknowledge dumb or absconding worshippers of God *as God's true worshippers*. But Paul, in conformity with his view has transposed the words meaning altars and prophets. Meyer pays attention to the plural, the altars, "as the temple at Jerusalem was the only place exclusively designed for service." But even in the temple at Jerusalem there were two altars. Yet the question here is concerning the *kingdom of Israel* and therefore the remark of Estius is almost super

* [See *Textual Note* [4]: "I am left the only one."—R.]

tuous, that it was even blasphemy to throw down God's altars on the high places.*

Ver. 4. **But what saith the Divine response unto him?** ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός; On χρηματισμός, see the Lexicons. [The substantive occurs only here in the New Testament. The cognate verb is used in Matt. ii. 12, 22; Acts x. 22; Heb. viii. 5; xi. 7, in the sense: *to be warned of God*, as the E. V. expresses it. The obvious meaning here: *Divine response*, seems to have been thus derived: the word first meant *business*, then formal audience given to an ambassador, and then an oracular response, though this was not the classical sense. See 2 Macc. ii. 4; xi. 17.—R.]

I have reserved to myself [Κατέλιπον ἐμαυτῷ. See *Textual Note* [b]. *To myself*, as my possession and for my service, over against the apostasy into idolatrous service (Meyer).—R.] The original expression: "I will leave me," has been changed by the Apostle into the past tense, without thereby altering the sense, as has been done by the LXX.

Seven thousand men [ἑπτακισχιλίους ἄνδρας]. It is sufficient to regard the number seven as the sacred number in relation to the services, and the number thousand as a designation of a popular assembly. Tholuck, after Kurtz (p. 591), considers the number seven as the perfect and covenant number. There are different ideas of perfection, according to which the numbers 3, 4, 7, 10, and 12, may be together regarded as numbers denoting perfection.† The Mohammedan saying, quoted by Tholuck, is interesting: that "God never allows the world to be without a remainder of seventy righteous people, for whose sake He preserves it."

[**Who never bowed,** οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν. Alford remarks on οἵτινες, which is a variation from the original, that it gives "the sense of the saying, as far as regards the present purpose, viz., to show that *all these were faithful men;* in the original text and LXX., it is implied that *these were all the* faithful men."—R.]

To Baal. The feminine τῇ Βάαλ has given occasion for much discussion. In the LXX. the name has sometimes the masculine and sometimes the feminine article. Why does it have the latter? As the LXX. of this passage has τῷ Βάαλ, Meyer has admitted a mistake of Paul's memory; Fritzsche holds that the codex which Paul read, contained a different reading. According to Olshausen, Philippi, Meyer [Stuart, Hodge], and others, the feminine form may be explained by the fact that Baal was regarded as an androgynous deity; but this is not sufficiently proved. According to Gesenius, the feminine form was understood as a contemptuous expression of idols; which view is also favored by Tholuck. The elder critics (Erasmus, Beza, Grotius) understood the word as applying to the statue of Baal. [So E. V.] Tholuck replies to this, by saying: *without analogy*. But the idol is the contemptible image or statue of the false god Yet, if we hold that Baal had no reality as god to the Jews, but merely as an idol, the whole series of feminine forms used in designating Baal becomes clear at once (1 Sam. vii. 4; Zeph. i. 4; Hosea ii. 8). Meyer is of the opinion that, in that case, it would have to read τῇ τοῦ Βάαλ; but this would fully destroy the probably designed effect of the feminine form. Tholuck observes: "In the Gothic language, *Guth*, as masculine, means God; but *gud*, as neuter, means idols;" and by this means he again approaches the explanation which, in passing, he has rejected. He does the same thing in his preceding remark: "In the rabbinical writings, idols are contemptuously called הָאֱלִילִים." On *Baal*,* comp. Winer, *das Wörterbuch für das christliche Volk*, and the *Hebrew Antiquities*, by De Wette, Ewald, and Keil.

Ver. 5. **Even so then in this present time** [οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ. Alford suggests: "*even in the present time, sc.*, of Israel's national rejection.—R.] God, according to that example, secures for himself a certain **remnant** [λεῖμμα] of the elect, according to His constant law of election—that is, **according to the election of grace** [κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος. Comp. chap. ix. 11. Stuart: "an election, not on the ground of merit, but of *mercy*.—R.]

Ver 6. **Now if by grace** [εἰ δὲ χάριτι. Δέ logical, *now*.—R.] Namely, that a λεῖμμα existed, and always continues to exist. Grace, or the gift of grace, cannot be divided and supplemented by, or confounded with, a merit of works. Augustine: *Gratia, nisi gratis sit, gratia non est.*

[**Then it is no longer of works: otherwise grace no longer becomes grace,** οὐκ ἔτι ἐξ ἔργων, ἐπεὶ ἡ χάρις οὐκ ἔτι γίνεται χάρις.—**But if it be of works, then it is no longer grace: otherwise work is no longer work,** εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων, οὐκ ἔτι χάρις, ἐπεὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐκ ἔτι ἐστὶν ἔργον. The critical questions respecting the second clause are discussed in *Textual Notes* [7], [8], [9], and at some length below. The discussion requires us to insert the verse in full.—R.] We may now ask how we must understand the parallel clauses? The usual explanation places the following in antithesis to each other: Now if it is by grace (that remnant, or its causality, the election), then it is simply not by the merit of works, otherwise grace is no more grace.—But if it be by works, then is it no more grace, otherwise work would be no true work, but mercenary work. In connection with this antithesis, clear and significant in itself, there arise, however, three questions: 1. Why does the Apostle enlarge the first proposition by the second, since the latter seems to be quite self-evident from the former? 2. What should the γίνεται (χάρις) mean, where ἐστι should be so positively expected that the Vulgate [E. V.], and other versions, have even substituted *est?* 3. Why is χάρις used instead of ἐκ

* [Still with Estius, Philippi, Hodge, De Wette, and others, it must be noted that, although the erection of the altars on the high places was originally forbidden in the kingdom of Israel (where Elijah lived), they had become the only places of true worship; and neglect of these would be really neglect of Jehovah.—R.]

† [The simplest explanation is that which takes this as a definite expression for an indefinite number (Stuart, Hodge, and others), without attaching any special significance to the number seven.—R.]

* [Wordsworth combines all the explanations: "The reason why the Septuagint sometimes used the *feminine*, why St. Paul adopts it here, appears to be, because not only a heathen God, but a goddess also (*Astarté*), was worshipped under the name of *Baal*, and because, by this variety of gender, the reader is reminded that there was no principle of unity in this heathen worship; and thus the vanity of the worship itself is declared." The fact that the LXX. uses both, seems to render the italics of the E. V unnecessary, and to render the interpretation thus assumed very doubtful.—R.]

χάριτος [to correspond with ἐξ ἔργων] in the second sentence?

As far as the first point is concerned, Tholuck says: "The genuineness of the antithesis 'εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων,' &c., is more than doubtful. Its oldest authorities are Cod. B., Peshito, Chrysostom, Theodoret (in the text). On the contrary, it is wanting in A. C. D. F. G., Origen (according to Rufinus), Vulgate, the Coptic Translation, and others. Yet Fritzsche has undertaken to defend this reading, and lately Reiche also, in the *Comm. Crit.*, p. 67; Tischendorf has preserved it in the text," &c. According to Tholuck, the addition has the character of a glossarial reflection. This appearance of such a self-evident amplification could, however, have also occasioned the omission.*

The γίνεται in the first sentence means, according to Tholuck: to result, to come out as. This explanation is just as doubtful as that of Meyer: "in its concrete appearance it ceases to be what it is by nature." [So De Wette, Alford, Philippi. The distinction between γίνεται and ἐστίν is ignored by many commentators.—R.] The χάρις, in the second sentence, must be understood, according to the current explanation, as the effect of the χάρις in the first sentence. In addition to this, we have the question: What is the meaning of "work is no more work?" Does the Apostle regard only *mercenary work* as a *true work?* We attempt the following explanation: If it is of grace, then it is no more of works; for grace does not first exist, or is not first in process of existence by works. Grace, according to its very nature, must be complete *before* works. But if of works, then no further grace exists,† because the work is not yet complete, and never will be complete as meritorious work. Works, considered as meritorious, are always an incomplete infinitude. But if grace should first be the result of works, it would not be present until the boundless future. If we accept this view, the literal expression is saved; and to the first declaration, that grace and the merit of works preclude each other, there is gained a second: Grace is naturally a *prepared* ground before the *existing* work, &c. (see also the continuation in ver. 7). The reading of Cod. B.: εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων, οὐκέτι χάρις, ἐπεὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐκέτι ἐστὶ χάρις, seems also to be a special attempt at an explanation. The real purpose of the antithesis is, that *the Apostle proves that the election of the people could only consist of those who establish themselves on grace, but not in the party which establishes itself on works.* If the matter were as those who rely on the righteousness of works desire, there would not be any grace; and grace would never be accomplished, because the righteousness of works is never accomplished, just as little as the tower of Babel was ever finished.‡

Vers. 7–11. *The great body of unbelievers who have not been able to obtain grace by works, are not the real substance of the people. They are essentially an apostate remnant of hardened ones. Yet their stumbling was not designed for their ruin, but for the salvation of the Gentiles.*

Ver. 7. **What then.** Τί οὖν. This inference, as well as the ἐπιζητεῖ, becomes quite definite, if we refer to the conclusion of the previous verse.—**That which Israel seeketh for he obtained not** [ὃ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραήλ, τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν. The latter verb is usually followed by the genitive; rarely, in the classics, by the accusative, as here. Hence we find, in *Rec.* (no MSS.), τούτου. See Meyer for the authorities for this use of the accusative. The meaning is not: *to find*, but *to attain to, to obtain.*—R.] Israel did not obtain that which it sought to obtain by works—grace, as the end of the finished work. Like a phantom beyond the ever unfinished work, grace had to recede ever further in the distance. The ἐπιζητεῖν can, at all events, also mean zealous striving [Fritzsche, Philippi, Hodge]; but it is clear that this idea would not be in place here. [Meyer says it indicates the *direction.*—R.] The present properly denotes "the permanence of the effort"—the permanence of the effort to find the city of grace at the end of the long road of self-righteousness.

But the election obtained it [ἡ δὲ ἐκλογὴ ἐπέτυχεν. *The election* for *the elect*, as the *circumcision* for *those circumcised*. Vivacious expression.—R.] Meyer says: "For they were subjects of Divine grace." Paul has already said, in other words: For the elect are distinguished by having received God's grace in faith.

And the rest were hardened [οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθησαν. The verb is rendered *blinded* in the E. V., here, and 2 Cor. iii. 14; in other places, *hardened*, which is decidedly preferable.—R.] Israel is divided into two parts. One part is the ἐκλογή, although it is the minority; the other is the λοιποί, the τινές, although they are the majority. Meyer says, they were hardened by God. [So Hodge, Stuart, Philippi (with a reservation), and Tholuck, in later editions; comp. chap ix. 18. The passive certainly includes this thought.—R.] Paul says, they have been hardened by a reciprocal process between their unbelief and God's judgments. The sense undoubtedly is, that those who remain for the incalculable periods of judgment have become, "in understanding and will, insusceptible of the appropriation of salvation in Christ" (Meyer), and insusceptible, above all, in their heart and spirit; because the last sparks of the spiritual life in them, which alone can understand the gospel of the Spirit, have expired; just as a sapless plant is no more supported by the sunshine, but is reduced to a dried-up stalk.

Ver. 8. **According as it is written.** [Stuart is disposed to find in καθὼς (א. B., Tregelles: καθάπερ) γέγραπται a declaration of analogy

* [Alford well remarks: "The object being *precision*, it is much more probable that the Apostle should have written both clauses in their present formal parallelism, and that the second should have been early omitted from its seeming superfluity, than that it should have been inserted from the margin." The want of exact correspondence is also against the probability of an interpolation, as Fritzsche has remarked: χάριτι—ἐξ ἔργων; γίνεται χάρις—ἐστὶν ἔργον; ἔργον at the close, where ἔργα might have been expected.—R.]

† [So Wordsworth, who accepts the very weakly-supported ἐστί of the *Rec.*, and accenting it thus: ἔστι, renders: "there is no longer any place for the existence of grace." But this is very doubtful.—R.]

‡ [The following paraphrase (abridged from Alford) may give a clearer view: "But if (the selection has been made) by grace, it is no longer (we exclude its being) of works (as its source); for (in that case) grace no longer becomes (loses its efficacy as) grace (the freedom of the act is lost, it having been prompted from without): but if of works (as the cause and source of the selection), no longer is it (the act of selection) grace; for (in that case) work is no longer work (work being 'that which earns reward,' its character is contradicted)." The same author remarks, that this point is stated so fully just here, because the Apostle was to enter upon such an exposition of the Divine dealings as rendered it necessary to show that their severity did not contradict their general character of *grace and love.*—R.]

rather than a citation of prophecy. So Tholuck; but Fritzsche, Meyer, and others, hold the latter view. "The perspective of prophecy, in stating such cases, embraces all the analogous ones, especially that *great one*, in which the words are most prominently fulfilled" (Alford). See below, note on ver. 10. On the free citation, see *Textual Notes* [*] [**].—R.] The citation is freely collated from Isa. xxix. 10; Isa. vi. 9; Deut. xxix. 4. Meyer denies that Isa. vi. 9 is taken into consideration; but if we compare the two other passages, they do not suffice for Paul's citation, since the assertion in Deut xxix. 4 contains merely negations.

God gave them. By no means a mere permission (Chrysostom), but likewise not simply *activity*, without something further. The ground of the judgment of **a spirit of slumber** [πνεῦμα κατανύξεως], or of deep sleep (רוּחַ תַּרְדֵּמָה), on Israel, is definitely declared, in Isa. xxix. 10, to be the guilt of the people; ver. 13 ff.—But the passage in Isa. vi. 9 ff., which constitutes the principal part of the present quotation, is explained immediately afterward in the conduct of Ahaz, in chap. vii. The third passage from Deuteronomy brings out more definitely the negative element in this hardening process: "Yet the Lord hath not given you a heart to perceive," &c. On the meaning and interpretations of κατάνυξις, see Meyer, p. 420; Tholuck, p. 596.*—[**Unto this day**; to be joined with what immediately precedes, since they are substantially from Deut. xxix. 4. So modern editors and commentators generally.—R.]

Ver. 9. **And David saith.** The second passage is taken freely from Ps. lxix. 22 (LXX.). Meyer says: "David is not the author of this Psalm (against Hengstenberg), which must be judged analogously to the expression in Matt. xxii. 43." Comp. on that passage the *Commentary on Matthew*, p. 404. First of all, it is quite easy to prove that the sufferings of the people in exile could not have been in mind in writing either the lamentations of Psalm lxix., or the "imprecations" on enemies. First, the theocratic exiles did not say that they had to suffer for the Lord's sake (ver. 7), and for zeal for His house (ver. 9). But they said just the contrary (see Ps. cvi.; Isa. lxiv.; Dan. ix.). And though the exile could also invoke God's wrath on the heathen, and wish them evil (Ps. lxxix. 6; cxxxvii. 9), the prophetic imprecations are very different, for they portray the judgments of blindness that are invoked on the spiritual adversaries of the theocratic faith, and of the house and name of the Lord, who proved their enmity by persecuting God's servant. Comp., in this respect, Ps. lix.; lxiv.; lxix. 22–28; cix. In such Psalms, either the personal, collective, or ideal † David chiefly speaks, because David has become the type of God's suffering servant. We therefore hold, with Luther, Rosenmüller, and others, that the concluding words (from ver. 32) are a later addition.‡

The imprecations themselves are a prophetico-ethical view, clad in the sombre drapery of the Old Testament. [Dr. J. Add. Alexander remarks, on this verse of Ps. lxix: "The imprecations in this verse, and those following it, are revolting only when considered as the expression of malignant selfishness. If uttered by God, they shock no reader's sensibilities; nor should they, when considered as the language of an ideal person, representing the whole class of righteous sufferers, and particularly Him who, though He prayed for His murderers while dying (Luke xxiii. 34), had before applied the words of this very passage to the unbelieving Jews (Matt. xxiii. 38), as Paul did afterwards."—R.]

Let their table become a snare [Γενηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα]. Philippi, with Origen, Tholuck, and others, has referred the table to the law and its works. But when Melanchthon says: *doctrina ipsorum*, the latter must be very carefully distinguished from the law itself. Chrysostom: *their enjoyments;* Michaelis, and others: the Jewish passover meal, at which the Jews were besieged, and which was followed by the destruction of Jerusalem; Grotius: the altar in the temple itself. The point of the figure becomes blunted, if we hold, with Tholuck, that *table* is mentioned, because it is at the table that surprise by an enemy is most dangerous. Rather, the table, or the enjoyment of life by the ungodly, becomes itself their snare, &c. Now this *table* can be something different at different times; generally, it is the symbol of comfortable banqueting in wicked security over the ungodly enjoyment of life (see Matt. xxiv. 38). With the Jews of the Apostle's day, this table was their statutes, and, above all, their illusion that the earthly glory of the kingdom of Israel would be manifested by triumph over the Romans. It is a fact that the table, the ungodly enjoyment of life, becomes a snare for the ruin of the adversaries of the Holy One; just as the pious man's table becomes a sign of blessing and victory (Ps. xxiii.). While they think they are consuming the spoils of their earthly sense, they become themselves a spoil to every form of retribution; just as the bird is led into the snare, and the deer is hunted, or perishes by a stumbling-block—that is, a trap.

[**And a trap, and a stumbling-block, and a recompense unto them,** καὶ εἰς θήραν καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον καὶ ἀνταπόδομα αὐτοῖς. See *Textual Note* [11].—R.] Paul has freely elaborated the original forms still further, by inserting καὶ εἰς θήραν. Likewise σκάνδαλον follows ἀνταπόδοσις in the LXX. The Vulgate interprets θήρα by *captio;* Fritzsche and Meyer adopt the same, while Tholuck and Philippi prefer the *instrument* [Ewald, Alford: *net*] of hunting, which applies to both the other means of capture, and not merely as a "hunting-spear." Meyer is incorrect in saying that this ruin is explained in what follows. For the following words describe the *inward* relations of the judgment of the ungodly, in antithesis to the judgment in the *outward* relations of life, which have been described by the foregoing words.

Ver. 10. **Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see** [σκοτισθήτωσαν οἱ

* [Fritzsche has an Excursus on this word, pp. 588 ff. He makes it = *stupor, numbness*, as from stupefying wine. Only here, and not in the classics. Incorrect, according to this view; Calvin: *spiritus compunctionis;* Luther: *einen erbitterten Geist.* —R.]

† [Philippi (following Keil) says that the subject in this Psalm is "not the ideal, but the concrete person of the righteous." Hengstenberg (so J. A. Alexander) adopts the other view.—R.]

‡ [The Psalm purports to be written by David. Dr. Lange's remarks are in support of this view of the authorship, though he finds it necessary, in order to sustain it by internal evidence, to admit the later addition of the concluding verses. The question of authorship does not, indeed, affect the question of the propriety of the phrase: *David saith;* but when it is so likely that David did write the Psalm, inventing theories to prove that he did not seems to be useless ingenuity.—R.]

ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν]. Spiritual blindness is one form of the inward judgment, and total despondency of spirit is the other.

And bow down their back alway [καὶ τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διὰ παντὸς σύγκαμψον. See *Textual Note* [12].—R.] The LXX. has translated the words of the original text, "and make their loins continually to shake," by: "make their backs crooked always;" a change to which the Apostle adheres, probably because it gives the expression of permanent dejection a somewhat more general character.—By *bowed-down backs*, Meyer understands spiritual slavery, while the early expositors understood Roman slavery. Yet this would be an important deviation from the original text. But, in reality, the bowed-down backs should mean the same thing as shaking or tottering loins.

Tholuck and Philippi have correctly observed, against Fritzsche, and others, that in ver. 8 (and the same thing applies also to ver. 9) the question is not the citation of a prophecy, according to which the unbelief of the Jews at the time of Christ must be a necessary result. Yet this remark does not suffice to show that the quotation takes place as in the citations in Matt. xiii. 14; John xii. 40; Acts xxviii. 26; which "refer, *vi analogiæ*, to the classical passage for the unbelieving conduct of Israel toward God, in Isa. vi." The most direct practical purpose of these citations in the New Testament is to prove to the Jews, from their own Holy Scriptures and history, that there was always in Israel an inclination to apostasy; and that it is therefore not contrary to faith in prophecy to charge the present Israel with apostasy (see the defence of Stephen). But then a really typical prophecy also underlies this purpose; yet it is not a fatalistic prophecy, but the idea of the consequence of ruin even to its historical consummation (see Matt. xxiii. 32 ff.).

Ver. 11. **I say then, Did they stumble in order that they should fall?** [λέγω οὖν, μὴ ἔπταισαν ἵνα πέσωσιν;] A qualification to guard against a false conclusion. They have certainly stumbled and fallen; but the purpose of their guilty stumbling and falling under the previously described judgment of hardness was not that they should fall, in the absolute sense, into the ruin of the ἀπώλεια. Their falling is economically limited, and economically turned and applied, to the salvation of the Gentiles (see chap. ix. 17, 23). The stumbling of the λοιποί took place against the stone of offence (chap. ix. 32, 33; x. 11). The ἵνα denotes the final purpose of the Divine judicial government, and is not merely ἐκβατικῶς, as Chrysostom, Augustine, and others, would have it.* Tholuck makes the noteworthy remark, that πταίειν, to stumble (which must not be referred, with De Wette, and others, to the σκάνδαλον mentioned in ver. 9, but rather to the λίθος προσκόμματος in chap. ix. 33), has the sense of *moral* stumbling; James ii. 10; iii. 2; and that πίπτειν, on the contrary, has this *ethically* figurative sense neither in the Hebrew, nor Greek, nor Latin, but only the sense of yielding to, sinking under.

But by their fall [ἀλλὰ τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι. On παράπτωμα, see p. 184, Dr Schaff's note.—R.] Meyer has no ground for not finding in παραπτ. the meaning of falling, but only the *delictum* (Vulgate) [so Alford], for they have really fallen, yet that was not the object (see also Tholuck, p. 600). Tholuck properly opposes, also, the view that here the principal thought is, that Israel should be restored, although an intimation of the restitution of Israel is included in the words. It is evident that the conversion of the Gentiles is primarily designated as the final object of Israel's fall; with this final object there is, indeed, again associated the final object of the preliminarily isolated and of the finally total conversion of Israel. The παραπτ. here can as little mean a mere "passing away," as a mere *infortunium*, which Reiche and Rückert, with others, would render it.*

Salvation is come. Ἡ σωτηρία. Γέγονεν must be supplied, according to the connection. The Apostle cannot have regarded this tragical condition as an absolute necessity; but he may very well have considered it an historical one. Israel, having been placed in its existing condition by its own guilt, did not desire the Gentiles, under the most favorable circumstances, to participate in the messianic salvation, except as proselytes of the Jews; and still more did it indulge the thought of vengeance on, and dominion over, the Gentiles; but it was impossible for Christianity, as Jewish Christianity, to become universal in the Gentile world. In addition to this came the experience of the Apostle, that he was always driven more decidedly to missionary labors among the Gentiles by the unbelief of the Jews; Matt. xxi. 43; Acts xiii. 46; xxviii. 28. The negative condition of this transition was apostolic preaching, and especially that of Paul.

In order to excite them to jealousy [εἰς τὸ παραζηλῶσαι αὐτούς. Instead of *jealousy*, we may substitute *emulation*, as the word is not used in a bad sense (Hodge). The clause is telic; the purpose was not the total fall, but that their moral fall might be used to further the salvation of the Gentiles, and this, in turn, bring about their own salvation as a nation.—R.] This purpose was associated from the outset, and the mention of it is here in place for the removal of the fatalistic thought, that their fall was decreed for their ruin.

Vers. 12–16. *As the unbelief of the Jews has been the means of effecting the conversion of the Gentiles, so shall the conversion of the Gentiles be still more not only the means of effecting the belief of the Jews, but, with this return of Israel, still greater things shall occur.*

Now if their fall . . . and their diminishing the riches of the Gentiles [εἰ δὲ τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτῶν . . . τὸ ἥττημα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος ἐθνῶν. In order to explain this difficult verse, we must start with the ἥττημα in Isa. xxxi. 8, which does not occur in classical language, but is there represented by ἧττα [Attic for ἧσσα, *a defeat*], the contrary of νίκη. In the passage cited, ἥττημα means not merely the being overcome, but the military diminution which is the result of defeat. At all events, it is to be taken

* [Although ἵνα is telic, as is now held by most commentators, the emphasis does not rest upon it, as though only the purpose were denied, and the fact admitted. Taking οἱ λοιποί as representatives of the whole nation, the Apostle admits the stumbling, and denies the final fall, intimating by his use of ἵνα, that another purpose was involved, viz., the salvation of the Gentiles.—R.]

* [The *fall* here must be taken as a less strong expression than the verb which precedes, if the view be adopted that denies the fact of a final fall. We must, then, hold that the national fall into utter ruin is denied throughout, while the stumbling and the moral fall of the individuals are admitted. So Alford.—R.]

here as diminution in captivity, according to the original text, for *menial servitude*. Likewise, in 1 Cor. vi. 7, the word means a moral loss, a diminution of the power of believers in opposition to the world. We therefore hold that the expression *ἥττημα* places the two other ideas in a more definite light, and that the whole expression alludes to the scene of a routed army. Even in military affairs, the dynamical antithesis of broken power and of the full sense of power is connected with the ideas of numerical diminution and numerical fulness; as, in the present instance, the weakening is connected with the loss of men, and full power with the complete number. Tholuck bases his explanation on the meaning of *πλήρωμα* in ver. 25.

Explanations of the *ἥττημα*: *diminutio* (Vulgate); minority, *defectus* (Chrysostom, and most commentators); injury, loss, fall (De Wette, and others). De Wette brings this explanation in exclusive antithesis to the first, with reference to 2 Cor. xii. 13. Fritzsche: Diminution of messianic salvation. Philippi: The damage to God's kingdom by their falling away. But Meyer remarks, with good reason, that the thrice-repeated *αὐτῶν* is in the same relation, the subjective genitive. Tholuck: Reduced state.* According to Tholuck, Meyer's explanation is: the minority; but Meyer himself pronounces against this explanation, and understands the word to mean, sinking and ruin. Ulfilas has interpreted the word, which means at the same time the loss of men and the weakening, by *the deficiency*. There is a real difference made by the reference to the believing Jews as the minority of believers (*paucitas Judæorum credentium;* Grotius), and the antithetical body of unbelievers, the moral field of the dead, or the captured, those subjected to slavery. But here, too, both parts cannot be separated. The *αὐτοί* are the whole people; the believers are the sound remainder of the army; while the unbelievers, the same as the fallen, or captives, are its *ἥττημα*.

How much more their fulness [*πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν*]. The *πλήρωμα*. Explanations: The whole body (Tholuck); the full number (Meyer); the restoration of Israel to its proper position (Rückert, Köllner); [Hodge: their full restoration or blessedness; Alford: their replenishment.—R.] Philippi: the filling up of the gap caused in God's kingdom by their unbelief. The latter view, which was first set forth by Origen, is discussed at length by Tholuck, p. 606 ff. But this view confounds in a twofold way: 1. The idea of the full number of God's eternal community in general, and the idea of material fulness (*πλήρωμα*), the whole number of the Jewish people; 2. The idea of the *economic* completeness in the present passage, and that of *eonic* completeness.†

Tholuck very properly calls attention to the apparent tautology in *πλοῦτος κόσμου, πλοῦτος ἐθνῶν*, which has been very much neglected by expositors. In *κόσμος*, he says, there seems to be comprised the idea of the whole extent of humanity and in *πλοῦτ. ἐθν.* there appears the more concrete designation: "The reduction of the chosen people turned to an enrichment of the profane nations." The former definition regards the qualitative, intensive, and teleological relation in an altogether universal sense: The fall of the historical Israel redounded to the advantage of the world, even including the ideal Israel. The latter definition describes the quantitative and extensive character of the historical course. Jewish tribes, or Jewish communities, drop out of the people, while, on the other hand, whole heathen nations are gained. But if their fall has thus been a gain to the world, how much more their fulness—that is, a believing Israel!

Ver. 13. **For I am speaking to you Gentiles** [*ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*. The sense is the same whether we read *γάρ* or *δέ*. A colon should follow this clause; the pointing of the E. V. obscures the proper connection.—R.] The declared prospect of the full conversion of Israel leads him to the further explanation, that he regards even the conversion of the Gentiles, though an object in itself, as a means for accomplishing the object of Israel's conversion. [According to Alford, this verse answers the question: "Why make it appear as if the treatment of God's chosen people were regulated not by a consideration of them, but of the less favored Gentiles?"—R.]—*You Gentiles;* that is, Gentile Christians.—[**Inasmuch then** *ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν οὖν*. See *Textual Note* [14]. The corresponding *δέ* is wanting, as often in the Apostle's writings.—R.] *Ἐφ' ὅσον*, not *quamdiu* (Origen, Vulgate, Luther).

I glorify mine office [*τὴν διακονίαν μου δοξάζω*]. Not: I praise my office (Luther, Grotius, and Reiche); but: I strive to glorify my office by its faithful discharge (De Wette, Meyer, and others); in which, indeed, he also says, that he esteems his office as a glorious one.*

Ver. 14. **My own flesh** [*μου τὴν σάρκα*. On *μου* in this peculiar position, see Meyer. D. F. put it after the noun. It is sufficiently emphatic to justify the emendation, *my own flesh*.—R.] An expression of inward participation with Israel in natural descent. Theodoret: The word leads us to understand the denial of spiritual participation. Ver. 28 proves that this antithesis is not very remote; yet the inward attachment to his people here appears in the foreground.

Ver. 15. **For if the casting away of them** [*εἰ γὰρ ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν*]. *Ἀποβολή*, throwing away, an antithesis to *πρόσλημψις*; see ver. 17. Therefore not their diminution (Vulgate, Luther). [So Bengel, Philippi, who find here also an allusion to the loss in numbers sustained by the kingdom of God.—R.] Tholuck alludes to the use of language in the LXX., and the Church (*ἀποβολή*, expulsion).

Be the reconciliation of the world [*καταλλαγὴ κόσμου*]. Not as causality, but as condition, without which the word of reconciliation did not reach the Gentiles without obstruction. [It

* [So Hodge, Alford: their impoverishment. The numerical idea is quite objectionable, although Dr. Lange seems to think it is included also. The whole verse, according to this view, means: "If their unbelief (*i. e.*, of one part of them) is the world's wealth, and their small number (*i. e.*, of believers, the other part of them) the wealth of the Gentiles, how much more their full (restored) number?" This arbitrarily changes the reference of *αὐτῶν*, puts a forced meaning on *ἥττημα*, and really weakens the force of the argument, which is: if their *sin* has done so much, how much more their *conversion?*—R.]

† [The numerical idea is lexically admissible in *πλήρωμα*, whence it has been transferred to *ἥττημα*, but even here it is not the prominent one. It is, however, to be understood, that the spiritual fulness will necessarily include the conversion of the nation as a whole.—R.]

* [Meyer thus paraphrases: "I seek, indeed, inasmuch as I am he, who has the apostolic mission to the Gentiles (notice the emphatic *ἐγώ*), to do honor to mine office, but purpose therewith to excite my kinsmen," &c. This brings out the force of *μέν*, and the connection of thought.—R.

is perhaps to express this shade of thought that the E. V. renders: *reconciling;* but *reconciliation* is more literal, and shows how important Paul deemed the fact in question, which could thus be characterised.—R.] In this free use of language Paul also says σώσω, in ver. 14, because he is the herald of σωτηρία.

What shall the reception of them be [τίς ἡ πρόςληψις]. Reception to salvation, and to participation in salvation by their conversion.

But life from the dead? [εἰ μὴ ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν;] It is clear that the Apostle awaits a boundless effect of blessing on the world from the future conversion of the Jews. We ask, What is it? We must first look at the antithesis: Their casting away became the reconciling of the world; that is, only *conditionally*, therefore *as if*, and *indirectly*. Thus, we continue, the conversion of the whole people of Israel will also be conditionally, as if, and indirectly, a life from the dead. With the *appropriated* καταλλαγή, there now begins, first, the spiritual resurrection, which is succeeded, second, by the future bodily resurrection. Hence different explanations:

1. Figurative expression of the new spiritual life (Augustine, Calvin, and others) of the Gentile world, or of the world in general, but not of the Jews (as Cocceius, Bengel, and others, explain), since the new life of the latter is regarded as an antecedent means. But this new life is also regarded in different senses: The further extension of God's kingdom, and the new subjective vivification (Philippi, and others), increase, and advance of piety (Bucer, Bengel). "A new life in the higher charismatic fulness of the Spirit shall extend from God's people to the nations of the world, compared with which the previous life of the nations must be considered dead;" Auberlen (calculated to mislead, and overdrawn, so far as the Christian life of the previous world is meant). Other modifications: Highest joy [Grotius, Hodge apparently], highest blessedness. [Stuart: something great, wonderful, surprising, like to what a general resurrection of the dead would be. He thinks it probable Paul had in mind Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones.—R.]

2. The literal view: The resurrection of the dead is meant—the oldest ecclesiastical explanation (Origen, Chrysostom, Rückert, Tholuck, Meyer, De Wette, &c.). Tholuck says that the meaning of this view is, that the conversion of Israel is regarded as the final act in the world's drama; but then he makes the objection, that ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρ. nowhere stands in the New Testament for the ἀνάστασις, and thus the expositor finds himself compelled to prefer the metaphorical exposition.

But it has not been sufficiently considered how very conditional the first proposition in the comparison is: for if the casting away of them be the reconciliation of the world. As this is a fact which is realized first up to and in the conversion of the *Pleroma* of the Gentiles, and then of the Jews, so is the consequence of their reacceptance a fact which is continued from the higher spiritual new life of the world to its consummation, particularly in the first resurrection. To the Apostle, the ideas of spiritual resurrection and bodily resurrection do not lie so far apart (see chap. viii. 11) as to our expositors; therefore Olshausen is right in applying the word to a spiritual resurrection, which takes place in the bodily resurrection. [Alford also combines the two views "Standing as it does, it must be *qualitative*, implying *some further blessed state* of the reconciled world, over and above the mere reconciliation. This might well be designated '*life from the dead*,' and in it may be *implied* the glories of the first resurrection, and deliverance from the bondage of corruption, without supposing the words to be = the resurrection from the dead."—R.]

Ver. 16. **Moreover, if the first-fruit be holy, so also is the lump** [εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα. Lange: *das Erstlingsbrod, the bread of the first-fruits—i. e.*, the portion of the dough taken as a heave-offering.—R.] After the Apostle has disclosed his prospect of the glorious results of Israel's conversion, he returns to the grounds for the hope of this conversion itself. He uses two similes. The first is taken from the significance of the bread of the first-fruit (Num. xv. 19–21). Ἀπαρχή can, indeed, denote the first-fruit, as well as the bread of the first-fruit; but it receives this meaning from the corresponding idea of the harvest; while, on the other hand, the baking of the first-fruit must correspond to the φύραμα, the kneaded dough. Therefore the expression here can neither mean first-fruit (Estius, Olshausen, and others), nor the grain for the bread of the first-fruit (Grotius). But the ἀπαρχή in general denotes the representative offering by which the whole mass, to which ἀπαρχή belongs, is consecrated to God. Thus is the consecration of the first-born to the priesthood (with which Levi was charged), the consecration of the people; the consecration of the first-fruit is the consecration of the harvest; and the consecration of the bread of the first-fruit is the consecration of the whole lump, which was afterwards prepared. [So Stuart, Hodge, Alford, De Wette, Tholuck, Meyer. Ἀπαρχή is necessarily defined by its correlative term φύραμα, the mass of dough for baking.—R.]

And if the root be holy, so are the branches also [καὶ εἰ ἡ ῥίζα ἁγία, καὶ οἱ κλάδοι]. This second simile is clear in itself: The branches correspond to the root (anomalous exceptions to this agreement, which may be found in nature, do not here come into consideration). The general fundamental thought of both figures is, undoubtedly, as Reiche holds, that the whole people is designated as good by its first-fruits as well as by its root. Interpretation of the particular parts:

1. Both figures mean the same thing. The ἀπαρχή are the patriarchs (Abraham, &c.); τὸ φύραμα, is the whole body of the people. The same relation applies to root and branches (the Greek fathers, Erasmus, Calvin, Tholuck, Meyer [Stuart, Hodge, Alford], &c.).

2. The figures are different. The second figure undoubtedly applies to the patriarchs and their posterity; but the first, by ἀπαρχή, describes the believing Jews, and, by φύραμα, the rest (Toletus, Cramer, and others. [So Wordsworth, who understands, by φύραμα, the whole mass of the world which is to be converted.—R.] Also, in reference to the first figure, Ambrosius, and others). Modifications: According to Origen and Theodoret, ἀπαρχή means Christ himself, and φύραμα, Christians. Meyer has two objections to the different rendering of the figures. First, it is contrary to the parallelism of the two passages. But apart from the fact that Paul's prose is not subject to the rules of the poetical parallelism of the Old Testament, this reasoning betrays a defective idea of the Old Testament parallelism itself. His second reason

that the Apostle elaborates the second figure only, is of just as little force; for, with the further resumption of the second figure, there is presented a perfectly new thought. The most untenable explanation is, that ῥίζα means the original Christian Church, and κλάδοι are the individual believing Jews.

We hold that the antithesis is very decided. From what follows, it is clear that the ideal theocracy, though represented by the patriarchs, yet not identical with them (see Isa. xi. 1, 10; Rev. v. 5; xxii. 16), must be regarded as the root of Israel. In fact, from the foregoing citations, the same Christ is certainly the root of the old theocracy, as He is the ἀρχή in the ἀπαρχή of the new Jewish believing Church, and the *causa efficiens* of the sanctification of both. But according to the antithesis here presented, ῥίζα is the patriarchal foundation of the theocracy as the natural disposition consecrated to God; while the ἀπαρχή, on the contrary, is the first Jewish body of believers prepared by God as the bread of the first-fruit for the first harvest festival of the time of fulfilment, the Christian Pentecost. The present passage is related to Rom ix. 5, the fathers being regarded as the root, and Christ as the miraculous fruit of the branches.

[It is evident, from Dr. Lange's note, how difficult it is to support the twofold sense of the verse. As Tholuck remarks, the ἁγιότης is the point of comparison. *Holy* here means not only as consecrated to God, but as actually pure. If a distinction must be made between the two figures, it seems natural to find these two ideas of holiness given prominence in each respectively. Those certainly miss the point of both figures, and the argument of the Apostle as well, who do not find here, in "lump" and "branches," a reference to Israel, considered as the people of God. Alford: "As Abraham himself had an outer and an inner life, so have the branches. They have an *outer life*, derived from Abraham by physical descent. Of this no cutting off can deprive them. But they have, while they remain in the tree, an *inner life*, nourished by the circulating sap, by virtue of which they are constituted *living parts* of the tree. It is of *this life* that their severance from the tree deprives them; it is this life which they will reacquire if grafted in again." This obviates some difficulties, and is, on the whole, the simplest explanation.—R.]

Vers. 17–24. *The conditionality of the new antithesis of believing Gentiles and unbelieving Jews. The figure of the wild and the good olive tree. Warning for the Gentiles, and hope for the Jews.*

Ver. 17. **But if some of the branches were broken off** [εἰ δέ τινες τῶν κλάδων ἐξεκλάσθησαν. The E. V. is too conditional in its form.—R.] Although there were many of them, they were nevertheless a small minority, compared with the incorruptible tree of God's kingdom. With this fact, the heathen should also prize the value of the theocratic institution itself.

And thou being a wild olive tree [σὺ δὲ ἀγριέλαιος ὤν]. As the expression ἀγριέλαιος ὤν can mean, as a substantive, the wild olive tree itself, but, as an adjective, the belonging to the wild olive tree, we prefer, with Fritzsche and Meyer, this latter view to the former, which is defended by Luther, Philippi, and Tholuck, with this explanation: The address, "thou being a wild olive tree," views the individual Gentiles as a collective person.* Meyer objects to this, by saying, that "not whole trees, and also not quite young ones (against De Wette), are grafted in." Against this we may remark: 1. That the wild olive tree of the Gentile world is destined to be transferred, in all its branches, to the good olive tree; 2. This has already taken place incipiently by Paul's mission to the Gentiles. Meanwhile, the Apostle was as far from supposing a total apostasy of the Gentile Church, as from admitting the possibility of a total apostasy of the Jews. Likewise, he speaks of a *being grafted in* having already occurred, with reference to the probable boasting of Gentile Christians over Jewish Christians. Besides, the Apostle considers the wild olive tree to be converted in all its branches just as little as in the case of the good olive tree. Likewise, ver. 24 must be kept in mind, where the same subject is not the wild olive tree itself, but only one branch of it. On the wild olive tree, or oleaster, comp. *Natural History of the Bible*, and the Dictionaries. Pareus: *oleaster habet quidem formam oleæ, sed caret succo generoso et fructibus.*

On the Oriental custom of strengthening olive trees that had become weak by grafting them with the wild olive, comp. the citations in Tholuck, p. 617; in Meyer, p. 348. Now, if this custom were frequent, and occurred in various ways, there would be apparently an incongruity in the figure, in so far as the cuttings of the wild olive are designed to strengthen the olive tree; but the question here is a communication of the sap of the good olive tree to the branch of the wild olive. Therefore Tholuck remarks: "Paul was either not acquainted with the arboricultural relation of the matter, or—which is more probable, when we look at the triviality of this notice—he designed to say, that has here taken place by grace, which otherwise is contrary to nature." † But, in our opinion, this does not settle the question. First, the *tertium comparationis* does not lie in the *breaking off* and *grafting in* of the branches In relation to this point, the figure is of perfect application. Secondly, though the branches of the wild olive tree communicate to the good olive tree a new and fresher life, and a vegetative vital nourishment (such as, for example, the Germans, at the time of the Reformation, gave to the Christian Church), this does not preclude the necessity of their receiving from the root and stem of the olive tree the good sap and productive power which produce the olive fruit.

Wert grafted in among them [ἐνεκεντρίσθης ἐν αὐτοῖς]. The ἐν αὐτοῖς is differently rendered. The most simple rendering is: *among them.* [So Meyer, Alford, and most. Stuart, De Wette, Olshausen: *in place of them.* The

* [There is a lexical objection to taking ἀγρ. ὤν as an adjective, since, when thus used, it means: made out of the wood of the olive (Alford). The reason for adopting this view is to escape from the thought that the whole Gentile world, as such, was grafted in. This is done quite as properly by supposing the whole tree here put for a branch of it. The tree, moreover, is introduced to recognise the fact of a distinctively Gentile life existing as a whole.—R.]

† [This last view is that of the majority of the best commentators, and is so natural and obvious, that nothing is gained by departing from it. Meyer intimates that the Apostle's illustration must be taken in accordance with the *fact*—*i. e.*, the fact respecting the coming in of the Gentiles—which was undoubtedly the grafting of wild branches on a good tree, to partake of the life and bear the fruit of that good tree. Furthermore, as a fact, there was no new and fresher life imparted *by the Gentiles* at that time, as Dr Lange intimates. The Roman and Greek civilisation, continually decaying, was only preserved so long by the new religious life from the patriarchal root.—R.]

former is preferable on account of συγκοινωνός.—R.]

And made fellow-partaker of the root and fatness [καὶ συγκοινωνὸς τῆς ῥίζης καὶ τῆς πιότητος. See *Textual Note* [15].—R.] Not ἓν διὰ δυοῖν (Grotius, and others). The communication with the root secures participation in the good sap.

Ver. 18. **Boast not against the branches** [μὴ κατακαυχῶ τῶν κλάδων]. The Jews in general were the branches of the olive tree; thus Jewish Christians are as much meant as the unbelieving Jews; not the latter alone (according to Chrysostom [Alford, Stuart, De Wette], and others), but rather the former principally, as is indicated by the ἐν αὐτοῖς. [Meyer: the Jews in general. He rightly adds, that not all Jews, who were not converts as yet, were to be regarded as broken off; only those who had rejected Christ.—R.]

But if thou boast [εἰ δὲ κατακαυχᾶσαι. The verb, occurring twice in this verse, is unusual.—R.] Meyer: *Triumphest against them.* According to the assumed figure of the wild olive tree, they could be tempted to boast that the members of the Jewish believing Church had received new life through heathenism, just as the boast has been made that Germanism, and especially Lutheranism, has reformed Christianity itself; while Christianity, operating from its very foundation, has reformed, and still reforms, its phenomenal forms. [*Mutatis mutandis*, of special application everywhere.—R.]

Thou bearest not the root [οὐ σὺ τὴν ῥίζαν βαστάζεις. Supply: *know that*, or, *let this humble thee, that.* See Winer, p. 575.—R.] Thou, as a grafted branch, standest in no more favorable relation to the root than those which are broken off and remain standing. Thou remainest thoroughly conditioned by an inward fellowship with the root, which must be confirmed in the humble knowledge of this dependence, and in inward union with the natural branches. The brief explanation is strengthened by the fact that it forms an immediate conclusion. Tholuck remarks: Such a presumption toward the branches could not be without presumption toward the root.

Ver. 19. **Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, &c.** [ἐρεῖς οὖν Ἐξεκλάσθησαν [οἱ] κλάδοι, κ.τ.λ. See *Textual Note* [16].] The genuineness of the article οἱ is rendered very probable by the intention of the Gentile speaking. After this religious warning, he will appeal to a religious decree, to a *fait accompli* of predestination. He accordingly abuses the truth which the Apostle himself has taught, by saying, negatively: the fate of the branches is irrevocably settled—there is no more salvation for the Jewish people; but he also abuses it, positively, by believing that he himself stands firm through the privilege which he presumes he has acquired. Here, then, we clearly see how the Apostle dismisses such a predestinarian presumption.

Ver. 20. **Well** [καλῶς]. Ironical, as if one would say: a fine application of the doctrine of Divine predestination, by overleaping the ethical elements brought into the account by it! [With Stuart, Hodge, Meyer, Alford, and others, it must be held that the Apostle here admits the purpose in the breaking off, as stated in ver. 19; but he admits it only to protest against the wrong use made of it.—R.]

Because of unbelief they were broken off [τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν. On the dative, see Tholuck and Alford *in loco.* The latter suggests *their unbelief, thy faith* (so Amer. Bible Union), but it seems better to take the nouns as abstract.—R.] The earnest declaration. That is, because of unbelief, expressed in strengthened form by the dative. That, therefore, is the decisive cause of their hurt, the real hindrance to their salvation.

[**And thou standest by faith,** σὺ δὲ τῇ πίστει ἕστηκας.] And thus thou also standest and endurest only *by* faith.* The standing means here the being grafted in, and not, standing in the absolute sense, as Meyer correctly observes, against Tholuck, and others. For the opposite of it is not falling, but the being cut off. Essentially, the idea certainly coincides with *standing* and *falling.*

[**Be not high-minded,** μὴ ὑψηλοφρόνει. See *Textual Note* [17].—R.] Be not therefore proud of an imaginary privilege, but **fear** [ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ]; that is, be all the more afraid of falling, because thou art inclined to boast. Bengel: *timor opponitur non fiducia, sed supercilio et securitati.*

Ver. 21. **For if God spared not the natural branches** [εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο]. Nature here evidently denotes the elevated, consecrated, and ennobled nature of the Abrahamic race.—**Lest he also spare not thee** [μήπως οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται. See *Textual Note* [18]. Supply *fear*, or, *it is to be feared.* See Winer, pp. 442, 470, 556. On the future, Buttmann, *N. T. Gram.*, p. 308.—R.] Thou at least hast no claim to this genealogical nobility of Israel. Meyer: "The future is more definite and certain than the conjunctive."

Ver. 22. **Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God** [ἴδε οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν Θεοῦ]. The usual predestinarian system would say: The grace and justice of God. Paul says something quite different. The period [E. V., colon] gives grammatical support to the reading ἀποτομία, &c., accepted by Lachmann.

On those. Ἐπὶ μὲν τούς. The goodness, as well as the severity or sharpness of God in continual movement, corresponds to human conduct.—[**Severity,** ἀποτομία. See *Textual Note* [19].—R.]

[**But toward thee, God's goodness,** ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ χρηστότης Θεοῦ. See *Textual Note* [20]. The nominatives give an elliptical construction: *there is severity, there is the goodness of God.*—R.]—**If thou continue in his goodness** [ἐὰν ἐπιμείνῃς τῇ χρηστότητι. *That goodness.* Alford: *If thou abide by.*—R.] On the living ground of God's free grace and mercy. Meyer: *Wilt have continued.* Should the goodness have first begun then?—**Otherwise thou also shalt be** [ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ. Comp. ver. 6. The E. V. conveys the correct meaning of ἐπεί.—R.] Meyer very appropriately calls attention to the stronger expression: ἐκκοπήσῃ.

Ver. 23. [**And they moreover,** κἀκεῖνοι δέ. This is the reading adopted by Griesbach,

* [Both datives are rendered: *durch*, by Dr. Lange. The E. V., however, varies from *because of* to *by*. Alford has the following discriminating note: "'*Through*' indicates better the *prompting cause* of a *definite act*—'*by*' the *sustaining condition of a continued state.* Thus we should always say that we are justified *through*, not *by*, faith; but that we stand *by*, not *through*, faith." Hence the propriety of the rendering of this verse in the E. V.—R.]

Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and critical editors generally, on the authority of ℵ. A. B. C. D. F. The rendering is that of Alford, who is unusually happy in expressing the exact force of δέ.—R.] —**For God is able to graft them in again** [δυνατὸς γάρ ἐστιν, κ.τ.λ.]. He will not apply His power to compel unbelievers to believe; but if they only do not continue in unbelief, He will graft them in again. He is not wanting in power, and certainly He will not be wanting in the application of it. The becoming strong for faith, and in faith, as well as the being planted in again, is exercised by the power of Divine grace.*

Ver. 24. **For if thou wert cut out.** The γάρ serves to establish the δυνατὸς γάρ (Meyer). Likewise the stronger expression here: ἐξεκόπης.—**Of the olive tree which is wild by nature.** This is the idea of the oleaster, or wild olive.—**And wert grafted contrary to nature** [καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ἐνεκεντρίσθης]. We doubt the propriety of translating παρὰ φύσιν exactly by *against nature* (*contra naturam;* Vulgate). Comp. chap. i. 26, p. 87. There exists no absolute opposition between the oleaster and the good olive tree; otherwise the grafting in would have no result. The application is clear.†

How much more. Nevertheless, a greater natural relation exists between the branches which are cut out of the good olive tree, and this olive tree as peculiar to them; so that they, after all, can be grafted more easily into them than the branches of the wild olive are grafted into it. The difficulty which arises from the consideration that the (Jewish) *obduratio* is more difficult to be overcome than the (Gentile) *ignorantia*, is removed by Tholuck, when he says that he regards the γάρ of the present verse as coördinate with the δυνατὸς γάρ, so that it would relate to the ἐγκεντρισθήσονται (ver. 23). But this changes the matter very little; the Apostle's supposition is, that the economy of God's government will accomplish the dissolution of the Jewish *obduratio*.

[Alford clearly defines the meaning: In the case of the Gentile, the Apostle sets the fact of *natural growth* over against that of *engrafted growth;* here, the fact of congruity of nature (τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐλαίᾳ) is set against *incongruity*, as making the reingrafting more probable. Hodge: "The simple meaning of this verse is, that the future restoration of the Jews is, in itself, a more probable event than the introduction of the Gentiles into the Church of God." —R.]

Vers. 25–36. *The last word, or the mystery of the Divine government.*

Ver. 25. **For I would not, brethren.** The γάρ confirms the previous πόσῳ μᾶλλον; according to Tholuck, the address, "brethren," is directed this time to the Gentile Christians. But why not to all? Οὐ . . . ἀγνοεῖν, Rom. i. 13 [p. 70], &c. An announcement of an important communication.

Of this mystery. Τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο [See Tholuck and Alford *in loco* on the word *mystery*.—R.] On the basis of the general mystery of the Christian εὐσέβεια, 1 Tim. iii. 16, revealed to Christians by their becoming believers, there are displayed the individual mysteries which concern the development of Christian life in the world, particularly the universal development of Christianity. In regard to these, the Apostles are illuminated in advance by revelation, in order to communicate them to the Church. Thus Paul communicates, in many ways, to believers, the mystery that the Gentiles shall be joint-heirs of life, without legal conditions, Eph. iii. 6; also the mystery that, in the last times, the transformation of persons still living will take place, 1 Cor. xv. 51; and so here he communicates the mystery of the Divine economy in relation to the results of the conversion of Jews and Gentiles, and especially of the final, universal conversion of Israel.

Lest ye should be wise in your own conceits [ἵνα μὴ ἦτε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς φρόνιμοι. See *Textual Note* [11].—R.] Meyer: According to your own judgment. The Apostle foresees that, in the Gentile Christian Church, there will arise respecting Israel's future contemptuous decisions of the unilluminated and self-sufficient judgment. [Calvin, Beza, Stuart, refer it to pride in their own position, but Meyer, De Wette, Hodge, and most, agree, with Dr. Lange, in applying it to a wrong view of the exclusion of the Jews.—R.]

That hardening in part is happened to Israel [ὅτι πώρωσις ἀπὸ μέρους τῷ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν. On πώρωσις, see ver. 7. —R.] Ἀπὸ μέρους; according to Calvin, qualitative, *quodammodo*, and not total hardening; yet it evidently refers to the unbelieving portion of Israel. [De Wette, Meyer, Hodge, join it with γέγονεν, not with πώρωσις or τῷ Ἰσραήλ (Estius, Fritzsche): *Hardening has happened in part.* Most commentators now adopt the *extensive*, rather than the *intensive* signification.—R.] This hardening of a part has befallen all Israel

Until the fulness of the Gentiles [ἄχρις οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν]. For then the hardening shall cease. Meyer: "Calvin's *ita ut* is alleged, in spite of the language, to remove the thought of a final object; on which account Calovius, and most, elaborate here a good deal, in order to bring out the sense that *partial* blindness, and therefore partial conversion, will last until the end of the world." [With Tholuck, Hodge, Alford, and others, we must insist that a *terminus ad quem* is here affirmed.—R.]

The fulness of the Gentiles. Interpretations: 1. The completion of the Israelitish people of God by believing Gentiles (Michaelis, Olshausen, and others); 2. The great majority of the Gentiles (Fritzsche) [Stuart, Hodge: the multitude of the Gentiles.—R.]; 3. Meyer, strikingly: "The filling up of the Gentiles—that is, that by which the body of the Gentiles (only a part of whom have as yet been converted) is full—the fulness of the Gentiles." [So De Wette. This makes it = πλήρωσις.—R.] As the Apostle could not have meant an indefinite mass of Gentiles, nor yet all the Gentiles down to the last man, he evidently had in view an organically dynamic totality of the heathen world, in which he unquestionably bethought himself of the conversion

* [As Stuart well remarks, this verse speaks of what *can* be done; the next, of what *will* be done. It is greatly to be doubted whether the verse has any bearing on the questions of *perseverance*, *conversio resistibilis*, &c., which Meyer, and others, find involved here.—R.]

† [There seems no good ground for departing from the common rendering. Dr. Lange's idea about real fresh life in the branches is not admissible. For, although fresh physical and intellectual life has again and again come into the Church from new races, it has always been, for a time, at the expense of spiritual vigor. Not until the new spiritual life, contrary to nature, had been felt, was there any gain by such grafting.—R.]

of the Gentile world. [Alford: The totality of the Gentiles, as nations, not as individuals. This is substantially the view of Lange, and differs but little from that of Meyer. "The idea of an elect number, however true in itself, does not seem to belong to this passage." Wordsworth is not likely to favor a predestinarian view, and yet he finds in πλήρωμα the notion of the complement of a ship's crew—*i. e.*, of the Church, the Ark of Salvation!—R.]

Come in [εἰσέλθῃ. *Shall have come in* (Noyes)]. In the absolute sense; therefore, into the kingdom of God (Matt. vii. 13, &c.). Meyer says, oddly enough: "The kingdom of the Messiah, the establishment of which is later, is not yet in question." [Meyer refers to the *personal reign* of the Messiah, beginning with the Second Advent. This period, on which he lays great stress in his commentary, will come in, he thinks, after the event here predicted.—R.]

Ver. 26. **And so.** Οὕτως, in this order and succession, and in this mode of accomplishment; after the conversion of the Gentiles, and by means of it.

All Israel [πᾶς Ἰσραήλ]. This is not spoken of all Israel in isolated examples, nor of the "totality" without exception. The former supposition, for example, that only the elect part, the true λεῖμμα, is meant (Bengel, Olshausen, and others), or only the greater number and mass (Rückert and Fritzsche), does not arrive at the idea of the nation, which here, in its totality, as all Israel, comes just in antithesis to the mere λεῖμμα. The latter supposition (Gennadius, Meyer, and others) transcends the idea of the *Pleroma*, which will suffice here in the case of the Jews as in that of the Gentiles.

This simple apostolic prophecy, pronounced directly in the future, has been much criticized, and much fanaticism has played about it.

Definitions *narrowing* the meaning: (1.) The spiritual Israel of the elect, from Jews and Gentiles (Augustine, Theodoret, Calvin, Bengel, Olshausen [Wordsworth], &c.); (2.) An election from Israel will be saved in the millennial kingdom (Baldwin, Bengel). "The one hundred and forty-four thousand of Rev. vii. 4, in which the number is literally interpreted as the principal citizens of the city of Jerusalem;" (3.) Israel *will be able* to be saved (Episcopius, Semler, and others); (4.) The prophecy has already been fulfilled by the myriads of Jews, of whom Eusebius speaks, chap. iii. 35 (Wetstein, and others); (5.) Luther, as Jerome before him, has fallen into glaring contradictions in relation to this question (see Tholuck, pp. 629, 630, and the quotation in Meyer, note, on p. 439); and on this point Melanchthon has proved, by his vacillations, his fear of Luther's decisive declarations on the hopelessness of the Jews (Tholuck, p. 630). On the further shape which Lutheran exegesis has taken on this point, see the same. With Spener there came a change.

In opposition to all these, there are definitions *exaggerating* the meaning: (1.) The πᾶς must be so much emphasized, as to lead us to suppose that Israel, dying in unbelief, will be raised from the dead for the realization of this hope (Petersen, *Mystische Posaune;* see Tholuck, p. 628). (2.) We do not include here the idea of a return of the main part of the Israelites, as a nation, to Palestine, but the ideas that a special Jewish Church will again arise—that a temple will be built in Jerusalem, in which a sort of restitution of the Israelitish worship will take place, and that then the Jewish people will stand as the preferred priestly and noble people in the midst of the believing Gentile world (comp. Tholuck's quotations, p. 625, in addition to which many others might be easily collected).

These fanatical apologists for Judaism should not forget that Israel has fallen so deeply, just because of such aristocratic and priestly claims to the messianic sphere of salvation, and that the only help for it is to acquiesce modestly in the glory of the New Testament spirit of Christ, and to take its place among the Gentile Christian nations as a fully authorized Christian nation, without legal privileges, but full of an humble sense of its long apostasy, yet in the power and demonstration of the Spirit, which will then be imparted to it according to its gift—that is, according to its great natural state transformed by grace. The scholastics Abelard, Thomas Aquinas, and others, had in view the proper mean, a conversion of the collective tribes, or tribal fragment, of the nation, but not the conversion of each individual, which is qualified as such by free self-determination. The hope of Israel's conversion has been warmly defended in the Reformed Church; first by Beza. See Tholuck, p. 629 ff.*

The question of the source from which Paul drew this μυστήριον has engaged much attention. Tholuck, following in the wake of others, properly calls attention to the fact that the Apostle's quotations from the prophets were given by him as a *warrant* of his hope, but not as its *ground;* p. 625 ff. Paul, as an Apostle, was also a prophet, apart from the consideration that he could already find the germs of this prophecy in the gospel tradition (see Matt. xxiii. 39; John xii. 32). However, we take for granted that he could have drawn his warrants from the Old Testament as freely as he desired, though Tholuck raises the question why he did not do this, but contented himself with citing two passages not belonging to that class, and of doubtful relevancy (the declarations cited by Auberlen, p. 625). We must here refer to biblical theology, as well as to the writings which have treated especially on this eschatological part of the theology of the Old Testament.†

There shall come out of Zion, &c. [Ἥξει ἐκ Σιών, κ.τ.λ. See *Textual Note* [22], and below. Forbes makes the four lines of the quotations correspond alternately: covenant-promise—removal of sin.—R.] The two connected quotations are from Isa. lix. 20 and xxvii. 9; not (according to Calvin [Stuart], and others) from Jer. xxxi. 33, although there is a kindred sense.‡ They are freely

* [The view now generally adopted, and supported by Beza, Estius, Koppe, Reiche, Köllner, Meyer, Tholuck, De Wette, Hodge, Stuart, Alford, and a host of others, is: that the ancient people of God (so marvellously preserved in their distinctive life, as if in earnest of this) shall be restored, *as a nation*, to God's favor. With all the modifications of this view from other passages, we have not to do. Thus much ought to be admitted by all fair rules of exegesis.—R.]

† [The Literature on this subject is very extensive. The passages bearing on this particular point are grouped by Demarest and Gordon, *Christocracy*, pp. 234 ff. Comp. Meyer, pp. 442 f.—R.]

‡ [So Tholuck, De Wette, Meyer, Alford. Dr. Hodge thinks it probable "that here, as elsewhere, he does not intend to refer exclusively to any one prediction, but to give the general sense of many specific declarations of the ancient prophets." The objections urged throughout against such a view of the Apostle's citations are applicable here.—Philippi remarks that these citations support the affirmation: "so all Israel shall be saved," not the continuance of the hardening "until the fulness of the Gentiles come in."—R.]

treated, and joined together (from the LXX.). Yet, in reality, they perfectly answer to their application. We must not forget that the armor of deliverance which the Lord puts on, according to chap. lix. 17 ff., is a further enlargement of the armor of the Messiah in Isa. xi. 5 ff. Now, if we adhere to the position that prophecy makes no retrograde movement—that therefore *Jehovah*, instead of the *Messiah*, must denote a progress—the passage cannot be understood merely to denote the first appearance of the Messiah, as Isa. xi., but, in any case, the eschatological appearance of Jehovah is also conjoined in the Messiah. This is favored by the grand expression in ver. 19. The Apostle, with his usual masterly skill, therefore makes use of the proper passage here, similarly to the exegesis of Christ, which has also been a subject of surprise to many expositors.

The original text (Isa. lix. 20, 21) reads: "And the God (Redeemer) shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression (פֶּשַׁע) in Jacob, saith the Lord. As for me (on my side), this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: My Spirit," &c. The Septuagint: *καὶ ἥξει ἕνεκεν Ζιὼν ὁ ῥυόμενος, καὶ ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ, εἶπεν κύριος. Καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, εἶπεν κύριος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐμόν, κ.τ.λ.* Chap. xxvii. also treats of the restoration of Israel. Ver. 6 gives the more definite starting-point. The sense of ver. 8 is: God punishes Israel with moderation. The form of this punishment is hardening, and being carried off as by an east-wind storm. Then we read: "Therefore (by this means) shall the iniquity of Jacob be purged; and this is all the fruit (the use) to take away his sin." The LXX.: *Διὰ τοῦτο ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἡ ἀνομία Ἰακώβ, καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἡ εὐλογία αὐτοῦ, ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι αὐτοῦ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν.* Paul took into consideration three modifications: (1.) *From* Zion, instead of *for* Zion, in which we must not forget that also in Isaiah Jehovah must come from Zion for Zion; (2.) The original text assumes conversion at the announced redemption; with the Apostle it was self-evident that the redemption precedes the conversion; (3.) The Apostle describes the new covenant with Israel, by inserting the passage from Isa. xxix.; that is, he here describes the purging and taking away of Jacob's sin as the essential part of the covenant, instead of the promise of the impartation of the Spirit, in Isa. lix., because he knows that both are indissolubly connected. Yet these modifications of form do not prevent the citation from being a *proof*, as Tholuck supposes. See, on the further exposition of this passage, Tholuck, p. 631.

[Tholuck: "How came the Apostle, if he wished only to express the general thought that the Messiah was come for Israel, to choose just this citation, consisting of two combined passages, when the same is expressed more directly in other passages of the Old Testament? I believe that the ἥξει gave occasion for the quotation: if he did not refer this directly to the second coming of the Messiah, yet it admitted of being indirectly applied to it."—R.]

Ver. 28. **As touching the gospel, they are enemies** [*κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐχθροί*]. As enemies, they are said, by Meyer and Tholuck, to be hostilely treated by God [Alford, Hodge] (Tholuck: *invisi deo*). But it is difficult to establish the antithesis, that they can be simultaneously odious to, and beloved by, God, except in different relations. See the *Exeg. Notes* on chap. v. 10 [p. 165]. Other explanations: regarded by Paul as enemies (Grotius, Luther); enemies of God (Thomas Aquinas, Bengel). According to the gospel—that is, according to the relation of the gospel to believers and unbelievers—they are enemies; this means not merely that they are adversaries of the gospel (Chrysostom, and others), but that, as adversaries of the gospel, they are regarded by God as adversaries, and then by His messengers also—**for your sakes** [*δι' ὑμᾶς*]: from the ground of the saving economy already set forth.

But as touching the election, they are beloved [*κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἀγαπητοί*]. We would here also protest against the favorite division: beloved of God, *or* of the Apostle, *or* of Christians. They are enemies in their falling out with the gospel, yet they are favorites according to the election, but simply for the sake of their connection with the fathers.—**For the fathers' sakes** [*διὰ τοὺς πατέρας*]. Meyer says: in favor of the patriarchs; the sense is, because they are included in general in the election of the fathers; according to ver. 28, are made partakers in the gifts of the fathers, in the *call* of Israel.*

Ver. 29. **Without repentance** [*ἀμεταμέλητα*. The reference here is evidently national, not individual, though the proposition is general in its form and force.—R.]. Unrepented. Irrevocable in the sense of a Divine, ethical, and self-conditional result (see 2 Cor. vii. 10).

Ver. 30. **For as ye**, &c. [*ὥσπερ γὰρ ὑμεῖς*. See *Textual Notes* [24], [25].] The Gentiles.—Formerly disobedient. The *ἀπιστία* is *ἀπείθεια* toward God's word, which was promulgated to the Gentiles by the creation (Rom. i. 21). [Forbes finds, in vers. 30–32, a six-lined stanza, two lines in each verse, with the alternating thoughts: Disobedience—mercy, recurring three times.—R.]

Ver. 31. **That through the mercy shown to you they also may obtain mercy** [*τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθῶσιν*. We accept (with E. V., Hodge, Meyer, De Wette, Alford, and most) a trajection of the *ἵνα*.—R.] Meyer would join *τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει* to what follows: "In order that, by the mercy manifested to you (which mercy provokes them to jealousy of your faith; ver. 11), mercy might be shown to them." This construction must be rejected outright, because by it the Apostle would say to the Gentiles what is both ill-bred and untruthful, namely, that their conversion was merely a means for the purpose of the further conversion of the Jews.† The opposite construction: *non crediderunt in vestram misericordiam* (Vulgate), emphasizes the conversion of the Gentiles as an end in itself, and then makes the further purpose of the conversion of the Jews, thereby brought about, to follow.

* [The obvious meaning is, that the election of Israel as the people of God involves such a hope of blessing to the children of Abraham, that the mercy will at last come, even after "thousands of *generations*." If the Abrahamic covenant is abrogated, the Apostle's words have little force—R.]

† [Notwithstanding this very strong assertion of Dr. Lange, on the ground of the parallelism, as well as on account of the general thought of the whole passage, the construction of Meyer is to be preferred. The trajection gives emphasis to τῷ ὑμ. ἐλ. The other views are: *They are disobedient through the mercy*, &c. (Calvin, and others); *they have not believed on the mercy shown to you*, &c. (Luther, Estius, Lange). But to these there is the same grammatical objection. Tholuck says: *with the same mercy*; which obviates Dr. Lange's difficulty, but is against the parallelism.—R.]

Ver. 32. **For God hath shut up all under disobedience** [συνέκλεισεν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπείθειαν. On the verb, comp. Gal. iii. 22, 23, *Textual Note* [26], and below.—R.] That is, the Jews as well as the Gentiles. According to Meyer, *all* and *every* Gentile and Jew are meant, and not merely the masses of both (according to Tholuck, and others). True, the masses are, in a certain sense, the *all-concluding;* yet, strictly emphasized, all and every one cannot be spoken of, because the question is not simply the fall of man, but the generic consequences of the fall (Vulgate and Luther have the neuter). [The neuter is probably borrowed from Gal. iii. 22. The sense is the same, whether we accept the view of Meyer or that of Tholuck; but by pressing the former in the second clause, a conclusion might be inserted, which Meyer himself does not accept, viz., the actual exercise of saving mercy in the case of every individual. —R.]

But what does *shut up* mean? Meyer would explain it, according to the peculiarity of the later Greek: to give over to, or under, the *effective* power, but not merely a *declarative* (Chrysostom, and others), or permissive power (Origen, and others). [Meyer, Alford, and others, remark that the συν in composition strengthens the simple verb, without, however, introducing the idea of shutting up *together*.—R.] The real explanation of the expression is contained in Rom. v. 12 and Gal. iii. 22. The state of the totality of men (their being shut up under disobedience) is based on the *organic* (*generic, social, political, and sympathetical*) *connection*. By the organic connection, all men are shut up in the consequences of the fall. Then, by the organic connection, the Gentiles are first shut up in the process of unbelief (see chap. i.); and in the same way are the Jews also shut up by means of this organic connection (chap. ii.). In the collective character of the history of the world, this makes a collective *conclusion* [*Zusammengeschlossenheit*]. Thus the Jews, by their organic connection (according to Gal. iii. 22), were shut up under the law, as it were, in a prison or place of custody * (ἐφρουρούμεθα συγκεκλεισμένοι); although, after the confinement was abolished, it turned out that they consisted of two parts, the children of the bondwoman and the children of the freewoman. Thus it could only come to pass, by the fearful power of the connection of the universal currents, that sin should be consummated in unbelief under God's judgment, in order that sinners might become receptive of Divine mercy (Rom. v. 20; vii. 13).

In order that he may have mercy upon all [ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσῃ]. The purpose of this authoritative judgment of God (that is, of this Divine hardening, which was carried constantly further by the reciprocal action with human guilt) was, first, that fulfilment in the ancient time, when the heathen world was ripe for mercy, and will be hereafter the fulfilment of the New Testament time, when Israel shall be ripe for mercy.

[Alford remarks on τοὺς πάντας in the two clauses: "Are they the same? And, if so, is any support given to the notion of an ἀποκατάστασις of *all men?* Certainly they are identical, and signify *all men*, without limitation. But the ultimate difference between the *all men* who are shut up under disobedience, and the *all men* upon whom the mercy is shown, is, that by all men *this mercy is not accepted*, and so men become *self-excluded* from the salvation of God. GOD'S ACT remains the same, equally gracious, equally universal, whether men accept His mercy or not. This contingency is *here not in view*, but simply God's act itself. We can hardly understand the οἱ πάντες nationally. The marked universality of the expression recalls the beginning of the Epistle, and makes it a solemn conclusion to the argumentative portion, after which the Apostle, overpowered with the view of the Divine mercy and wisdom, breaks forth into the sublimest apostrophe existing even in the pages of Inspiration itself." Comp. *Doctr. Note* 21.—R.]

Ver. 33. **Oh the depth of the riches, and wisdom,** &c. [ὦ βάθος πλούτου καὶ σοφίας, κ.τ.λ. In the English, that interpretation has been followed which regards the three genitives, πλούτου, σοφίας, γνώσεως, as coördinate. Θεοῦ is joined with all three.—R.] Constructions:

A. What a depth: 1. Of riches; 2. Of wisdom; 3. Of knowledge (Chrysostom, Grotius, Olshausen, Philippi [Hodge, Alford, De Wette], &c.

B. What a depth of riches: 1. Of wisdom; 2. Of knowledge (Luther, Calvin, Reiche).* Meyer says, in favor of the first construction: "As vers. 33 and 34 portray the σοφία and γνῶσις, but vers. 35 and 36 the πλοῦτος θεοῦ, the former construction is preferable." Besides, the depth of the riches would be, in a certain measure, tautological. But βάθος can also not (according to the same writer) mean "*the great fulness and superabundance*," because there would merely result such a tautology. The depth, whose outward figure is the ocean, is also a spiritual depth (see the quotations in Meyer). There is also another sort of fulness, as a rich and fruitful plain. Here God's miracles are obscured by a holy darkness. But the *riches of God* are not merely God's *riches of grace* in the special sense, for the fulness of creation and the treasures of redemption constitute a more general unity in the all-sufficiency of God. This is the entire ontological and soteriological foundation of God's kingdom. If, now, σοφία be defined as the exercise of God's *designing* attribute, the idea also usually includes the knowledge and choice of means; here, however (according to Meyer, for example), γνῶσις denotes the knowledge of means. Proof: αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ, His measures, must be referred to the latter. But the *ways* have just as decided a relation to the starting-points as to the final points, and we would here also hold to the distinction: γνῶσις relates *chiefly* to the ἀρχαί and its consequences, and σοφία *chiefly* to τέλη and their premises.†

How unsearchable, &c. [ὡς ἀνεξεραύνητα, κ.τ.λ. See *Textual Note* [27]. Meyer refers αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ to γνῶσις, τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ to σοφία; the former in the sense of *His modes of dealing, His economies*, the latter, *His judicial decisions* (as ver. 32). So Tholuck, but the distinctions are very subtle. See below.—R.] The *most unsearchable* character of God's judgments consists in His causing redeeming acts to arise from them (Gen. iii.: the flood; the Egyptian plagues; the Babylonian captivity; the cross of Christ); and

* [Comp. Lange's *Comm. Galatians*, p. 85 ff.—R.]

* Reiche's arguments, and the answers given by Tholuck, will be found in Alford *in loco*.—R.]

† [Bengel: SAPIENTIA *dirigit omnia ad finem optimum;* COGNITIO *novit finem illum et exitum*. See *Doctr. Note* [22] —R.]

the peculiarity of His ways as *past finding out*, consists in His leading the minds which He has created through byways, circuitous paths, apparently contrary roads, and even impassable roads, safely to their object (see Job v. 9; ix. 10; xxxiv. 24).

Ver. 34. **For who hath known the mind of the Lord?** &c. [τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου; κ.τ.λ.] Isa. xl. 13, "almost exactly" from the LXX. The mind took knowledge of the object; the counsel took knowledge of the ways. Or, the former word applies to the γνῶσις, the latter to the σοφία (Theodoret, and others). In wisdom He is exalted even above the understanding of man ("My thoughts are not your thoughts"), with respect to His counsel, above the necessity of man's being a counsellor with Him; finally, with respect to His riches, no one has enriched Him or given to Him so that He had to recompense unto him again; He is the absolute source of all good things.

Ver. 35. **Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again?** [ἢ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ; See *Textual Note* [22], for the text of the Hebrew and LXX.—R.] From the original text of Job xli. 11. No gift must be regarded as a recompensing of God.

Ver. 36. **For of him, and through him** [ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ]. The negation of the previous proposition is carried out positively in the completion of the doxology. *All things are of Him.* He is the *original fountain, original ground* and *author.—Through Him.* Preservation, government, redemption.

And unto him [καὶ εἰς αὐτόν]. *Toward Him as end.* That He may become all in all (1 Cor. xv. 28); He is glorified in all, and all is glorified in Him. Meyer says: "In so far as every thing serves God's purposes (not merely God's honor, as many would have it)." But every thing always serves God's purpose. Yet the final, absolute glorification of God cannot be separated from the purpose of the revelation of His δόξα in Christ, and by Him in His children, His inheritance.

Ambrose, Hilary, Olshausen, Philippi, and others, have regarded this passage as an expression of the relation *of Father, Son, and Spirit.** Meyer opposes this, by urging that neither Chrysostom, Œcumenius, Theophylact, Calvin, nor Beza, have referred to the Trinity in their expositions. The context speaks simply of God the Father. Yet it cannot be doubted, if we take into consideration other passages of the Apostle (for example, 1 Cor. xv.; Col. i.), that Paul here had in mind at least the difference *of the revelations* of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. It is certain that the view of God's absolute unity predominates here, but not therefore in the exclusive, doctrinal definiteness of God the Father. The Trinitarian relation lies beyond subordinationism.

* [Alford, who is unusually happy in his comments on this chapter, remarks: "If this be rightly understood—not of a *formal allusion* to the three Persons in the Holy Trinity, but of an *implicit reference* (as Tholuck) to the *three attributes of Jehovah*, respectively manifested to us by the three coequal and coeternal Persons—there can hardly be a doubt of its correctness." "Only those who are dogmatically prejudiced can miss seeing that, though St. Paul has never *definitively expressed* the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in a definite formula, yet he was conscious of it as a living reality."—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. While the whole of Paul's Epistle to the Romans has been called a "christological philosophy of the history of the world and of salvation," the term applies more specially to the section chap. ix.-xi., and preëminently to chap. xi.

2. God has not cast away His people: Proofs (1.) The *public* history of Israel: Paul and his Jewish companions in faith; (2.) Israel's *concealed* history, disclosed by God's declaration to Elijah; (3.) The teleology of the partial blindness of Israel *a.* a condition for the conversion of the Gentiles, *b.* then this a condition for the conversion of the Jews; *c.* then this, finally, a condition for the completion of God's saving work on earth; (4.) God's exercise of judgment on all humanity has always a merciful purpose—that is, deliverance and restoration. The history of proselytes proves that the attraction of the Jews to faith is constantly fulfilled in the individual.

3. The history of the seven thousand hidden worshippers of God at the time of Elijah, a type of similar cases in all ages. Not merely the *heroic* witnesses for God's honor are His people, but all who do not bow the knee to idols. The kingdom of God has not merely its lions, but also its doves. The mildness of the Divine judgment on the remnant of piety on earth, in antithesis to the severity and indignation of the human zeal of the well-meaning servants of God.

4. God preserves at all periods, even in the worst, a λεῖμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος. When the enemies of the gospel think that Christianity will soon decline, they miscalculate, especially on two or three points: (1.) They do not observe that the blight of division is unavoidable in their own camp; (2.) That a new Divine seed of Divinely chosen children, of sincere adversaries converted and led by God, and of courageous witnesses for God, are in His plan; (3.) That every direction which apostasy takes, leads to a dispersion and taint like that of the Jews, while the deep current of the world's history takes its course with God's kingdom. This confidence is resplendent even throughout the Old Testament, and especially in the prophets.

5. Vers. 6, 7. The unanswerable syllogism of the evangelical Church against the decree of the Council of Trent (see *Exeg. Notes*). *To seek grace beyond works* is an ἐπιζητεῖν, comprising in itself a self-contradiction.

6. Vers. 8-11. The twofold judgment of blindness: *a.* By external, seeming happiness (see chap. ii. 4); *b.* By inward disobedience, whose fundamental characteristics are presumptuous blindness and inconsolable, cowardly despondency in relation to the highest good.—On the process of hardening as a continual reciprocity between human offence and God's sovereign judgment, see *Exeg. Notes* on chap. ix. On Jelaledin Rumi's doctrine of predestination, see Tholuck, p. 595.

7. From the fact that judgments on unbelievers are remedial judgments, which are the means of producing faith in the elect, there follows the expectation that the judgments are not of an *eonic*, but of an *economic* nature. God always seeks, through the believers, indirectly to reach again the unbelievers. Therefore the messengers of salvation must shake the dust from their feet when they are not received That is, they must go *farther and farther!* The

gospel went from Mesopotamia to Jerusalem, from Jerusalem to Rome, from Rome to Wittenberg and Geneva; and in roundabout ways and circles it again goes from New York to Jerusalem and Mesopotamia. Nearness and farness in God's kingdom are not determined by geographical and national proximity and remoteness, but by the relations of spiritual life.

8. The idea of the temporary filling up of the breaches made by the unbelief of the Jews by means of the heathen, has penetrated, though in obscure form, even the Talmud (see Tholuck, p. 600).

9. On the reflection of the truth of the historical character of the Acts of the Apostles, in ver. 11, see Tholuck, against Baur, p. 602. See the same, p. 606, for Origen's view that the number of saints is definite; which, indeed, only has an incidental importance for the question before us (see *Exeg. Notes*).

10. The tragical fate of the Jews. Their fall the riches of the world, notwithstanding they number among them the richest people; their casting away the reconciling of the world. This latter thought refers to the crucifixion of Christ. Such a tragical judicial fate is such a profound enigma of Divine sovereignty, that not only the whole course of the world, but also the future world and eternity, belong to its full glorification in the light of Divine mercy.

11. As the wild olive tree enters into a relation of exchange with the good olive tree by giving to it earthly nutriment, or nutriment for development and for strengthening the stock, while, on its part, its branches are made good, so have the nations brought new organs to Christianity, in order to receive from it the Divine spirit of life. Germany may exult, in a special sense, in having done this, but nothing further. If we arrogantly identify German Christianity with Lutheranism,* the boast has a German Catholic sound; it is a boast of the branches—of only the grafted branches against those branches previously standing—yea, against the root itself.

12. The figure of the relation between the root and the branches condemns that entire theory of the development of Christianity, which the school of Baur has colored according to the Hegelian principles of history.

13. Vers. 20, 21. Tholuck: The predestinarian view here becomes involved in difficulty, in so far as it traces not only faith, but also unbelief, to the Divine causality. Evidently, the exclusion of the Jews is here designated as the result of their own guilt, &c.

14. On the possibility of falling from grace, see Meyer, p. 435, on ver. 23. *Sealed* believers are not here specially spoken of, but, in a general way, the *called*, the *awakened*.

15. There subsists not only an antithesis and a relation of degree between the wild olive tree and the good olive tree, but also a natural affinity, which, as well as the heterogeneousness, comes into consideration in the application of the figure.

16. On the discussions of recent theology respecting the relation of the Old Testament to the prophecy of the Apostle about the restoration of Israel, see Tholuck, p. 625.

17. In spite of the Apostle's warning, the grafted branches have in many ways boasted against the natural branches. Under this head belong the conduct of Christians toward the Jews, *the judgments passed upon the capability of the Jews for conversion*, and, finally, the opinion pronounced on converted Jews. Here belong also the predestinarian appeals to God's decree, under a disregard of the ethical conditions.

18. *The mystery*. Tholuck: "According to the ecclesiastical definition, *res captum humanæ rationis tum regenitæ quum irregenitæ transcendens* (Quenstedt, i. 44). According to the later expositors, on the contrary, it means, at least in Paul, unknown truths, hitherto concealed from humanity, and only known by revelation (Rückert, Fritzsche, Meyer, and Philippi)." The latter, or formal idea of the mystery, underlies the former, the material one. This is proved by 1 Tim. iii. 16. But it is clear, from ver. 33, that a mystery, in the material sense, is so called because it is of unfathomable depth; not because it merely extends beyond the human understanding in the abstract sense—or, in other words, because it is not attainable by the understanding—but only by the believing intellectual perception, because it ever reveals itself, in its Divine depth, *in infinitum*, but not because it should remain *in infinitum* an unsolved enigma.

19. Meyer acknowledges that the conversion of all Israel has not yet taken place; but he adds, that it lies in a very distant time, although the Apostle has regarded the matter as already near at hand; p. 442. This is the usual misconception arising from the failure to distinguish between the religious and chronological idea of the nearness and remoteness of time!

20. On the different renderings of *χάρισμα* and *κλῆσις*, see Tholuck, p. 633. A series of insufficient explanations of the *συνέκλεισεν* in ver. 32, is on p. 635; and discussions on the meaning of *τοὺς πάντας*, on p. 637.

21. It is worthy of note, that the usual doctrine of predestination, as well as the doctrine of restoration, has been connected with the present chapter, particularly with ver. 33. This contradiction is adjusted, if, with Schleiermacher, we regard predestination as *economical*, and restoration as *eonic*. True, even in that case, the consequence of the former idea is strongly affected by the reference to faith and unbelief as ethical motives for the Divine sovereignty. Against the latter idea, viz., the usual doctrine of the *ἀποκατάστασις*, Meyer observes, that the universality of the Divine *intention* does not preclude the partially finite non-realization of it through the guilt of human individuals. But this observation applies also to yesterday and to-day. Important weight rests upon the fact that the *συνέκλεισεν*, which is similar to fate in the organic connection of men (for example, a Jewish child, born in a Jewish alley, &c.), should be removed by God's sovereign grace; yea, that the currents of unbelief should give place to a current of faith. Judas has proved that a false individual can, at all events, swim against the stream of salvation. The eons of God and the freedom of man tower above the usual ideas of the *apocatastasis*, as well as above the usual ideas of eternal endless condemnation.*

* [*Lutherthum; Lutherism*, rather than Lutheranism. There is no thought of the Lutheran Church, as such, but of that spirit which traces all evangelical Christianity to the great reformer and his associates. If the figure of the Apostle has any special application now, it is against that illogical ultra-Protestantism, which, on the one hand, boasts itself against the mediæval Christianity, and, on the other, denies that any advance can be made beyond the theological thought of the seventeenth century.—R.]

* [A comparison ver. 32 with Gal. iii. 22 will assist us

22. The anthology of distinctions between σοφία and γνῶσις, see Tholuck, p. 641. The former (Abelard) constitutes just the reverse of ours: *sapientia quantum ad praescientiam ipsius scientia quantum ad ipsius operis effectum*, &c. Tholuck defines the σοφία, according to Proverbs, as the economic and architectural wisdom of God, and the γνῶσις as the knowledge of the nature of the universe. He, in opposition to Meyer, refers the κρίματα to the γνῶσις, and the ὁδοί to the σοφία. On the latter point, we must coincide with Meyer. The ideas: κρίματα and the essence of things, and ὁδοί and architectural dispositions, do not fit very well together. The κρίματα refer to final points; the ὁδοί are at least connected with starting-points. See *Exeg. Notes*. We must also refer, in reference to ver. 36, to Tholuck's instructive statements.

23. Rom. xi. 36; comp. 1 Cor. viii. 6; Col. i. 16; Heb. ii. 10; also the doxologies in the New Testament, and especially those in Revelation. [Stuart: "Such is the conclusion of the *doctrinal* part of our Epistle; a powerful expression of profound wonder, reverence, and adoration, in regard to the unsearchable ways of God in His dealings with men; and an assertion of the highest intensity respecting His sovereign right to control all things so as to accomplish His own designs. A doctrine truly humbling to the proud and towering hopes and claims of self-justifying men; a stumbling-block to haughty Jews, and foolishness to unhumbled Greeks. I scarcely know of any thing in the whole Bible which strikes deeper at the root of human pride than vers. 33–36.—But *sovereignty* in God does not imply what is *arbitrary*, nor that He does any thing without the *best of reasons*. It only implies that *those reasons are unknown to us*.—And if our hearts are ever tempted to rise up against the distinctions which God has made, either in a temporal or spiritual respect, in the bestowment of His favors, let us bow them down to the dust, as well as silence and satisfy them, with the humbling, consoling, animating, glorious truth, that 'of God, and through Him, and for Him, are all things.' To Him, then, be the glory forever and ever! Amen."—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

A. Vers. 1–6. Has God cast away His people? God forbid! 1. The thought is intolerable to the Apostle as a true Israelite. 2. He repudiates the fact in the most positive manner; because, *a.* God has provided for His people beforehand; *b.* In times of great apostasy He has preserved His remnant of seven thousand who did not bow the knee to Baal; *c.* He will deal likewise with those who have been reserved through grace.—Paul, as a model of truly national feeling. 1. He was a Christian with all his heart; 2. But he was also an Israelite with all his heart (vers. 1, 2).—The example of the Apostle Paul shows how Christianity and national feeling not only do not preclude each other, but agree very well together.—I also am an Israelite! An expression: 1. Full of manly power; 2. Full of Christian love (vers. 1, 2).—The example of Elijah. 1. His complaint *against* Israel; 2. God's answer *for* Israel (vers. 2–4).—God still has His seven thousand who have not bowed their knee to Baal (vers. 4–6).—Let the apostasy be never so great, God never wholly casts away His people (vers. 4–6).

LUTHER: Not all are God's people who are called God's people; therefore not all will be cast away, though the greater portion be cast away.

STARKE: God's children often make unnecessary complaints, and if the Lord should answer them, He would not reply in any other way than: "Ye know not what ye should pray for as ye ought" (ver. 2).—God can permit no such confusion of ideas, as that we are to be saved partly through grace and partly through merit; chap. iii. 28 (ver. 6).—HEDINGER: God has more saints in the world than we often imagine. Much of the good seed lies under the ground; in the Spring, when the right time comes, it germinates. Be comforted by this truth, ye faithful teachers; Isa. xlix. 1; 1 Kings xix. 48 (vers. 1–3).—*Nova Bibl. Tüb.:* God does not cast us away, if we have not previously cast Him away (ver. 1).—You regard that church and congregation as the best one to which the most belong, which the great men in the world honor, and which, therefore, has the most splendor, show, and consideration. Oh, no; it is the small and insignificant number which God has preserved for salvation according to the election. "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (ver. 5).—SPENER: God looks with other eyes than men's, and perceives those who were imperceptible to others. Yet such persons did not exist by their own strength, but *the Lord* has reserved them (ver. 4).

LISCO: The fall of Israel is neither altogether *universal* nor *perpetual*. The Gentiles' becoming God's people, and participants in His kingdom, is a fulfilment of Gen. ix. 27, that Japheth shall dwell in the tents of Shem.—As surely as unbelief, according to chap. x., is an offence, so sure is the better disposition of these better ones among the people *not any work of theirs*, but a work of Divine grace (vers 5, 6).

HEUBNER: There is a divine casting away, the most terrible penal judgment of God, in which He takes His Holy Spirit from man, and quenches the spark of good within him, so that he morally dies out, is without the feeling and power for good, and, shut out from heaven, must bear misery and torment.—This is what pious people since the fall have been anxiously praying God to ward off; Ps. li. (ver. 1).—Elijah believed that he was the only one left. How often does many a pious person believe himself alone! This is a divine trial; but in such hours there also comes equal consolation (ver. 3).—

in arriving at a correct explanation of its meaning. It expresses a bold, genial, and comprehensive thought, and contains the key to the understanding of the fall, as well as of the whole history of the world. The profound mystery of sin is here solved in the lustre of the Divine wisdom and love. The temporary abasement and neglect of countless individuals, of whole races and nations, is here subordinated to a more profound and exalted *plan* for general blessing. The Apostle, here and in Gal. iii. 22, teaches a *universality of sin and disobedience*, and a *universality of Divine grace* (so also Rom. v. 12 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22), and so places them in bold contrast, that the former must subserve the latter. This universality of grace refers: (1.) To the internal power and capability; (2.) To the purpose and design; (3.) To the proffering of the opportunity, or the calling. God can and will have mercy upon all men, and gives to all (at some period) this opportunity. But further than this we cannot go. Paul does not teach a universalism of *actual redemption to all men*. The acceptance or rejection of grace is made dependent on belief or unbelief. Hence, in Gal. iii. 22, he does not say, in the second clause: that the promise might be given to *all*, but *to believers*. For redemption is no natural process, no work of necessity, but a free act of God in Christ, and must be apprehended and appropriated in a free moral manner by each individual subject.—P. S.]

There is a seed of good people which never dies out. (*Indefectibilitas ecclesiæ.*)

B. Vers. 7–10. The judgment of hardening on the Israelites not belonging to the election. 1. Why is this judgment inflicted upon them? *a.* Not because it was determined from eternity against them; but : Because they, according to chap. ix. 30 ff., sought righteousness by works and not by faith, and, accordingly, became guilty themselves. 2. In what does this judgment consist? God fulfils in them what He, *a.* Has said by Isaiah; *b.* By David.

Nova Bibl. Tüb.: The terrible judgment of hardening! They have hell, who are smitten and do not feel it; who have eyes, and do not see; who have ears, and do not hear; who have poison and death instead of the bread of life; who have ruin, punishment, and condemnation, instead of strength, joy, and comfort; who have darkness instead of light, and earth instead of heaven.—Cramer: O God, Thou beautiful and clear light, Thou wouldst blind no one; and Thou only dost it as a righteous Judge after one has blinded himself in the power of the devil; 2 Cor. iv. 4 (ver. 10).—Roos: When the *table* (where they concoct mischievous devices), where they usually sit unconcernedly and eat good things, becomes a rope, a trap, ruin, and a recompense for the unfaithfulness and violence which they have exercised against others, it is a symbol of all the means by which men unexpectedly become involved in dangers by their words, or, by their deception or power, are led into the hands of their enemies, and sustain real injury (ver. 9).

Lisco: The burdens of age—dim-sightedness and crookedness—are likewise a symbol of ruin (ver. 10).

Heubner: God has *given* them such a spirit; that is, He has permitted it to visit them as a necessary consequence, as a righteous punishment, because they made such resistance to the strivings of the Divine Spirit (ver. 8). Comp. Acts ii. 37; vii. 51.—Man, both the individual and the people, declines into wretched slavery by apostasy from God (ver. 10).

C. Vers. 11, 12. The fall of the Jews is the salvation of the Gentiles. 1. No dark fatality rules here; but, 2. The loving providence of God, which continually turns every thing evil to a good purpose.—Nothing is so bad that God cannot make it serve a good purpose.—Providential sovereignty: 1. It is mysterious, in so far as we often cannot understand why it permits evil; 2. It is clear and plain, in so far as it always causes good to come from evil. Comp. Gen. l. 20.

Starke, Hedinger: What a great Artificer is God! He makes good out of evil, medicine out of poison, and something out of nothing.—Roos: Has God brought nothing good out of this evil? God forbid! From their fall there has taken place the salvation of the nations, to which the gospel was directed after it had been scorned by the Jews (Matt. xxi. 43; Acts xiii. 46–48; xxii. 18–21; xxviii. 27, 28) that the latter might be provoked to jealousy by the former.

Gerlach, Calvin: "As a wife who has been cast away from her husband because of her guilt is so inflamed by jealousy that she feels herself impelled by it to become reconciled again to her husband, so shall it now come to pass that the Jews, having seen the Gentiles taking their place, and being pained by their being cast away, shall strive after reconciliation with God;" comp. Eph. v. 25–33.

Lisco: God's wisdom brings good out of Israel's perversity. Paul does not say that the individual unbelieving Israelite cannot be lost; but there is quite a difference between the individual and the people (ver. 11).

D. Vers. 13–28. How does Paul wish to be regarded by the Gentiles? 1. By all means as their Apostle, who magnifies this his office; 2. But yet, at the same time, as a true friend of his lineal kindred, who wishes to be the means of saving some of them, because they are destined for life (vers. 13–16).—The rich mercy shown to Israel; perceptible, 1. From its rejection, which is the reconciling of the world; 2. From its reception, which is life from the dead (vers. 13–15).—The figure of the first-fruits as related to the justification of infant baptism; comp. 1 Cor. vii. 14 (ver. 16).—Likewise the figure of the root and the branches. (Comp. also the *Zurich Catechism*, Question 73, *b.*) The figure of the olive tree. 1. The Apostle warns the Gentile Christians against pernicious presumption (vers. 17, 18); 2. He takes away the strength from such a possible and proud objection on their part (vers. 19–21); 3. He exhorts them to behold God's goodness and severity (ver. 22); 4. He also declares to them his joyous hope of the future conversion of Israel (vers. 23, 24).—The branches do not bear the root, but the root bears the branches. Application: 1. To the relation of children and parents; 2. To the unconfirmed and the Church (ver. 18).—Do you stand by faith? Then do not be proud, but fear (ver. 20).—God's goodness and severity (ver. 22).—God can graft them in again; as this was the Apostle's hope for the children of Israel, so is it ours (ver. 24).—The future conversion of all Israel. 1. When will it take place? When the fulness of the Gentiles is come into the kingdom of God, and the time of the blindness in part of Israel is past. 2. Why will it take place? *a.* Because God has promised it by the prophets; *b.* Because God has once chosen His people; *c.* Because He does not repent His gifts and call (vers. 25–29).—The future conversion of Israel is a mystery, in the sense of Matt. xiii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 51.—The entrance of the fulness of the Gentiles into God's kingdom. 1. It will be effected by the preaching of the gospel among them; 2. It will take place amid praise and thanksgiving (ver. 25).

Starke: It is part of a teacher's wisdom to address himself especially to every class of men in an assembly (ver. 13).—One often falls, and yet by his fall another rises; oh, wonderful and yet holy government of God (ver. 15)!—A whole church, a whole ministry, a whole community, and a whole generation, must not be rejected on account of a few fools (ver. 16).—The living of the Jews among us in a dispersed way can be of use to us, for the frequent sight of a Jew, and his intercourse with us, remind us frequently of this Pauline admonition (ver. 21).—Why should you trouble yourself if you are not remembered in any earthly will as an inheritor of corruptible goods? If you stand in God's covenant of grace, you are more than rich (ver. 27).—Cramer: Let no one forget his origin, for that will teach him to be humble (ver. 17).—The human heart is guilty of two sins: it is deceitful, and desperately wicked; Jer. xvii. 9. Therefore God must oppose it by goodness and righteousness (ver. 22).—Hedinger: Do not cast away so soon what does not please you. Many sin by doing this. God has many ways to souls. Your neighbor is

guilty, and so are you. Shall the Lord cast both away? Bear and forbear. Time produces roses even from thorn-bushes (ver. 17).—Oh, how I wish that no one would sin against the poor Jews! Are they not Abraham's seed, and the lineal kindred of the Church? O God, take compassion on these hardened ones, and remember thy covenant!—The Jews, you say, only steal and cheat; they are a frivolous people! Are you better than they? Cannot God convert them? They hear the word, and so do you; neither you nor they are pious. Which has the greater condemnation—you, or these who are under a judgment? The same blindness will come over you, if you do not turn to Christ (ver. 23).—If it is a mystery, who would be so daring as to desire to fathom it? If it is a revealed mystery, who will deny the conversion of the Jews? Though you cannot imagine how it will come to pass, neither can I imagine how those who were formerly Gentiles and servants of the devil, shall now be God's children and the temple of His Spirit (ver. 25).—*Nova Bibl. Tüb.*: Every thing which God does must be regarded as for our improvement; His judgments to lead us to it, and His mercy and grace to keep us to it, even to the end. Because thy loving-kindness is better than life, my lips shall praise thee; Ps. lxiii. 3 (ver. 22).—QUESNEL: Let no sinner despair! There is no abyss of sin from which God cannot rescue him. He who returns to Him with faith and confidence, will find His bosom open to him (ver. 23).

SPENER, on ver. 23: We have here the clear testimony that the poor castaway people shall hereafter be received to grace, and be converted to their Saviour; and the promises once given them repeatedly in the prophets, shall be fulfilled in them. From the beginning of the Christian Church down to the present time, this has been taught and believed by its dearest teachers, from many passages of the Old and New Testament Scriptures; and we, too, have no ground of departing from it, or looking more at the hardness of those hearts which appear impossible to be converted, than at God's promise. Yet the time and manner of God's effecting the work we should as well commit to Divine wisdom, as rejoice with thanksgiving for Divine grace because of the thing itself; and when such a result is effected, we hope for all the more blessed condition of the Church, but meanwhile heartily pray for the fulfilment of such hope.

GERLACH, on ver. 16: The first figure says, the part has the nature of the whole; the second, the derived has the nature of its origin. The Apostle lays greatest stress upon the latter figure, for he dwells upon it afterward, and portrays it in clearer colors.—The Apostle purposely uses here a very striking figure, from a transaction which did not in reality occur—the grafting of the branch of a wild olive tree on a good stock—in order to show that the Gentiles, in a higher sense than the Jews, are called to salvation "contrary to nature" (ver. 24)—that is, by supernatural grace overcoming their nature; comp. Luke xii. 37 (ver. 18).—Paul calls every thing mystery which man cannot know of himself, and can only perceive by Divine revelation. Previously it was the call of the Gentiles (chap. xvi. 25; Eph. iii. 3), but now it is that of the Jews. Comp. Col. ii. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 51 (ver. 25).—The continued existence of the Israelites among all the remaining nations—this perfectly isolated phenomenon in history—is therefore designed by God to glorify hereafter His covenant faithfulness by a future total conversion of the people (ver. 26).

LISCO: Under what conditions we become and remain participants of God's grace (vers. 22-24).

HEUBNER, on ver. 16: Honorable forefathers as earnest admonition to their posterity (ver. 16).—Nothing more clearly proves the strict righteousness of God, than His judgment on the fallen angels and the unbelieving people of Israel. This should inspire every one with awe, and with solicitude for himself (ver. 21).—It is very necessary to bear in mind both God's severity and goodness; His severity, in order to be preserved from indulgence, false security, and backsliding; and His goodness, in order to be encouraged, and to hope for forgiveness and improvement. God has revealed both. Without the two together there would be no training of men (ver. 22).—Israel is without God, because it is without Christ; God has disappeared from the synagogue. He who would find God, must be converted to Christ (ver. 26).—The true deliverance of Israel does not take place by civil, but by spiritual, emancipation—the mercy of God. Mercy is the object of the reception of the Jews into the Christian Church (ver. 27).—God's friendship with the patriarchs endures eternally (ver. 28).

BESSER: It is *with* Mary, *with* the shepherds, *with* Simeon, *with* the first-called disciples, *with* the Galilean women, *with* the Apostles, and *with* the pentecostal Church of Jerusalem, and not without or separated from them, that thou, Gentile, hast a share in the root and sap of the olive tree. "Paul loves the little word '*with*,'" says Bengel, in speaking of the Gentiles; chap. xv. 10; Eph. ii. 19, 22; iii. 6 (vers. 17, 18).—See that you are not led into the folly of planting the top of the tree in the earth, and imagining that you bear the root, and that first from you, German blood, the good sap of the olive tree has really received strength and impulse (ver. 18).

DEICHERT (vers. 11-21): What serves for the fall of some, must serve for the support of others. 1. Corroboration of this experience generally and particularly; 2. For what should it serve both the fallen and the raised?

E. Vers. 29-36. God's general compassion on all. 1. On the Gentiles, who formerly did not believe, but now believe; 2. On the Jews, who do not believe, but shall hereafter believe (vers. 29-32).—All concluded in unbelief. 1. How far? 2. To what end? (ver. 32.)—The universality of Divine grace (ver. 32).—An apostolical song of praise: 1. For God's fulness of grace; 2. For His wisdom; 3. For His knowledge (vers. 33-36).—Every thing is *of*, *through*, and *in* (to) God (ver. 36). —To God alone be the honor (ver. 36)!

LUTHER, on ver. 32: Observe this principal declaration, which condemns all righteousness of man and of works, and praises only God's compassion in our obtaining it by faith.—STARKE: God must be the beginning, the middle, and the end of all things (ver. 36).—HEDINGER: How audacious not only to look upon God's council-chamber, but to become master of it! Men do not allow their political follies to be known; should we blind ones, then—we who are of yesterday and know nothing—invade God's wisdom? Job viii. 9. O man, be acute with the Scriptures, but not *on* and *beside* the Scriptures. Hypercritics mount high, and fall low; and it all amounts to nothing with the Divine Being (ver. 33).

SPENER: The loftiness of the divine Majesty

(vers. 33–36).—ROOS: What Paul has called the *election*, he immediately afterward divides into two ideas, *gifts* and *calling*, and says that God does not repent them. God has chosen Israel, and remains firm to it. He has from the beginning shown great mercy to this people; and He does not repent of all this. Single branches can, indeed, be cut off, and individual Jews can be lost in great numbers; but the whole tree will not be cut off, the whole people cannot be cast away (ver. 29).

GERLACH: God's purposes for Israel will continue uninterruptedly until the end of the present course of the world; as the fulfilment of all the promises, there is yet to take place a great popular conversion, and a mighty activity within the Church itself. But from all this we cannot conclude that there will be an external restoration of the Jews to a people in the political sense, and their return to the land of Canaan (ver. 29).—The survey of the wonderfully glorious saving purpose of God, as He gradually unfolded it in the foregoing verses to the eyes of the Apostle, leads the latter to make, from the bottom of his heart, this exclamation of amazed and adoring wonder. The *wisdom* of God comprehended the purpose which His love had prompted; and God's *knowledge* marked out the way, defined the measure, and ordered the course for its execution. His *judgments* even on His own children, when they wish to set up their own righteousness, and the *ways* in which He draws the most remote Gentiles and most hardened Pharisees to himself, are unsearchable; but they are not absolutely and eternally concealed, but the light of revelation is disclosed to man by the Spirit, which searcheth after the deep things of God, and reveals them to those who love God (vers. 33–36).

SCHLEIERMACHER: The contemplation of the order of salvation, that God has concluded all in unbelief, is also necessary to us for wonder at Divine wisdom. 1. God's concluding all in unbelief, constitutes the nature of this Divine order of salvation and of redemption through Christ. 2. In this, Divine wisdom is most to be perceived and admired (vers. 32, 33). — SCHWEIZER: The unfathomable depth of God's wisdom. 1. We represent this unfathomable depth to ourselves in *humility*; 2. We *lift ourselves up* in faith, since therein the ways of Divine wisdom are concealed (ver. 33).

THE PERICOPE *for the Sunday after Trinity* (vers. 33–36).—WOLF: How our reflection should be directed to the unsearchable purposes of God. We see, 1. From whence it should proceed; and, 2. To what it must lead.—RANKE: How one can learn to submit to God's incomprehensible ways: 1. By being humble; 2. By being confident.—PETRI: How should we act in regard to the incomprehensibility of God? 1. We should be discreet in our opinions; 2. We should be humble in our disposition; 3. We should be faithful in our work. —KAPFF: The Holy Trinity: 1. An unfathomable depth; 2. But an inexhaustible fountain of life.—FLOREY: Our inability to comprehend God is a reminder that should lead us to a careful reflection. It is: 1. A reminder of the narrowness of our mind, that we should be warned by it against useless subtleties; 2. A reminder respecting the Scriptures, that we should be moved thereby to hold fast to God's revealed word; 3. A reminder of eternity, that we should thereby think of the perfect knowledge which awaits us in the future world.—SCHULTZ: The Lord's ways: 1. How God glorifies them before our eyes; 2. To what end God's glory, which is declared in His ways, summons us.

[BISHOP HALL: *On Divine severity.* With how envious eyes did the Jews look upon those first heralds of the gospel, who carried the glad tidings of salvation to the despised Gentiles! What cruel storms of persecution did they raise against those blessed messengers, whose feet deserved to be beautiful! wherein their obstinate unbelief turned to our advantage; for, after they had made themselves unworthy of that gospel of peace, that blessing was instantly derived upon us Gentiles, and we happily changed conditions with them.—The Jews were once the children, and we the dogs under the table: the crumbs were our lot, the bread was theirs. Now is the case, through their wilful incredulity, altered: they are the dogs, and we the children; we sit at a full table, while their hunger is not satisfied with scraps.—*On the necessity of a living faith in Christ.* If ever, therefore, we look for any consolation in Christ, or to have any part in this beautiful union, it must be the main care of our hearts to make sure of a lively faith in the Lord Jesus; to lay fast hold upon Him; to clasp Him close to us; yea, to receive Him inwardly into our bosoms, and so to make Him ours, and ourselves His, that we may be joined to Him as our Head, espoused to Him as our Husband, incorporated into Him as our Nourishment, engrafted in Him as our Stock, and laid upon Him as a sure Foundation.—*On the incomprehensibility of Divine wisdom.* It is unfitting for the vulgar mind to attempt with profane foot to ascend the highest pinnacles of heaven, and there to scrutinize with presumptuous eyes the holy innermost places of God, and to pronounce an opinion on the most profound secrets of the Divine wisdom!—Shall we dare to measure the depths of the Divine law with the diminutive standard of our intellect? Shall we trample on things which even the angels gaze on with awe? But in this respect I do not so much blame the people as the teachers themselves, who have so inopportunely supplied the ears and minds of the multitude with these subjects.

[FARINDON: What better spectacle for the Church than the synagogue, in whose ruins and desolation she may read the dangerous effects of spiritual pride and haughtiness of mind, and thence learn not to insult, but tremble?—Take virtue in its own shape, and it seems to call for fear and trembling, and to bespeak us to be careful and watchful that we forfeit not so fair an estate for false riches; but take it, as from the devil's forge, and then, contrary to its own nature, it helps to blind and hoodwink us, that we see not the danger we are in, how that not only the way, but our feet, are slippery. It unfortunately occasions its own ruin, whilst we, with Nero in Tacitus, spend riotously upon presumption of treasure.—LEIGHTON: Our only way to know that our names are not in that black line, and to be persuaded that He hath chosen us to be saved by His Son, is this, to find that we have chosen Him, and are built on Him by faith, which is the fruit of His love who first chooseth us, and which we may read in our esteem of Him.

[CHARNOCK: *On regeneration.* The increasing the perfection of one species, can never mount the thing so increased, to the perfection of another species. If you could vastly increase the heat of fire, you could never make it ascend to the perfection of a star. If you could increase mere moral works to the highest pitch they are capable of, they can never

make you gracious, because grace is another species, and the nature of them must be changed to make them of another kind. All the moral actions in the world will never make our hearts of themselves of another kind than moral. Works make not the heart good, but a good heart makes the works good. It is not our walking in God's statutes materially, which procures us a new heart, but a new heart is necessary before walking in God's statutes.—*On the misery of unbelief.* Some humbled souls think God is not so merciful as He declares; He swears to expel their doubts. Presumptuous persons think God is not so just; He swears to expel their vain conceits. This sin ties up, as it were, the hands of an omnipotent mercy from saving such a one.

[TILLOTSON: We are apt to attribute all things to the next and immediate agent, and to look no higher than second causes; not considering that all the motions of natural causes are directly subordinate to the first cause, and all the actions of free creatures are under the government of God's wise providence, so that nothing happens to us besides the design and intention of God.—If God be the last end of all, let us make Him our last end, and refer all our actions to His glory. This is that which is due to Him, as He is the first cause, and therefore He does most reasonably require it of us.

[HOPKINS: Fear God, lest at any time, through any neglect or miscarriage of yours, He should be provoked to suspend His influence, and withdraw His grace from you, and to leave you to your own weakness and impotency, upon whose influence all your obedience doth depend.

[HENRY: The best evidence of integrity is a freedom from the present prevailing corruptions of the times and places that we live in; to swim against the stream when it is strong. Those God will own for His faithful witnesses that are bold in bearing their testimony to the *present* truth. This is thankworthy: not to bow to Baal when every body bows Sober singularity is commonly the badge of true sincerity.

[J. WESLEY: God always reserved a seed for himself; a few that worshipped Him in spirit and in truth. I have often doubted whether these were not the very persons whom the rich and honorable Christians, who will always have number as well as power on their side, did not stigmatize, from time to time, with the title of heretics. Perhaps it was chiefly by this artifice of the devil and his children, that the good which was in them being evil spoken of, they were prevented from being so extensively useful as otherwise they might have been. Nay, I have doubted whether that arch-heretic, Montanus, was not one of the holiest men in the second century.

[CLARKE: The *designs* are the offspring of infinite wisdom, and therefore they are all right; the *means* are the most proper, as being the choice of an infinite knowledge that cannot err: we may safely credit the goodness of the *design*, founded in infinite wisdom; we may rely on the due accomplishment of the *end*, because the *means* are chosen and applied by infinite knowledge and skill.

[BARNES, on ver. 14: We may see here, 1. That it is the earnest wish of the ministry to save the souls of men; 2. That they should urge every argument and appeal with reference to this; 3. That even the most awful and humbling truths *may* have this tendency; 4. It is right to use all the means in our power, not absolutely wicked, to save men. Paul was full of devices; and much of the success of the ministry will depend on a wise use of plans, that may, by the Divine blessing, arrest and save the souls of men.—J. F. H.]

PART SECOND.

The Practical Theme: The calling of the Roman Christians, on the ground of their accomplished redemption, or the UNIVERSAL MERCY of God (which will be extended to all), to represent the living worship of God in the completion of the real burnt-offering, and to form a universal Christian church-life for the realization of the call of all nations to PRAISE AND GLORIFY GOD, so that they too may recognize and sustain the universal call of the Apostle. In correspondence with this is the recommendation of his companions, assistants, and friends, in sending his greetings to them; in contrast with which is his warning against Judaizing and paganizing false teachers; chap. xii. 1–xvi. 20.—Conclusion. Salutations of friends. Amen (vers. 21–27).

LITERATURE.—BORGER, *Dissertatio de parte epistolæ ad Romanos paræneticа.* Lugd. Bat., 1810.

FIRST DIVISION.

THE CALLING OF THE ROMAN CHURCH TO A UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN DEPORTMENT

CHAP. XII. 1–XV. 13.

FIRST SECTION.—*The practical theme* (chap. xii. 1, 2). *The proper conduct of Christians toward the fellowship of the brethren for the establishment of a harmonious church-life* (vers. 3–8).

CHAP. XII. 1–8.

1 I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye [to][1]
present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable [well-pleasing] unto God,
2 *which is* your reasonable [rational] service. [,] And be not [And not to be][2]
conformed to this world: but be ye transformed [but to be transfigured][3] by
the renewing of your[4] mind, that ye may prove what *is* that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God [*or*, what is the will of God, what is good, and
well-pleasing, and perfect].[5]
3 For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among
you, not to think *of himself* more highly than he ought to think; but to think
soberly [*or*, not to be high-minded above what he ought to be minded, but to be
so minded as to be sober-minded],[6] according as God hath dealt to every man
4 the measure of faith. For as we have many members in one body, and all
5 members have not the same office: So we, *being* many, are one body in Christ,
6 and every one[7] members one of another. Having then gifts differing according
to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, *let us prophesy*[8] according
7 to the proportion of faith; Or ministry, *let us wait* on *our* ministering; or he
8 that teacheth, on teaching; Or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that
giveth, *let him do it* with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that
sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 1.—[The infinitive should be retained in the English rendering, for the sake of convenience in connecting the infinitives, which are to be accepted as the correct readings in ver. 2.

[2] Ver. 2.—[The *Rec.* (with ℵ. B[1]. L., many versions and fathers) reads: συσχηματίζεσθε, which is adopted by Wordsworth and Tregelles. The majority of modern editors and commentators (Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tholuck,

De Wette, Meyer, Alford, Lange) accept the infinitive; so A. B[3]. D. F. Most of these support συνσχηματίζεσθαι, rather than συσχ. Meyer says: "It is quite as likely that the imperative was written, to make ver. 2 an independent sentence, as that the infinitive was substituted for the sake of conformity with ver. 1." Accepting the infinitive, we place a comma at the close of ver. 1, and emend as above.

[3] Ver. 2.—[Here the infinitive μεταμορφοῦσθαι receives the additional support of ℵ.—The E. V. is more euphonious than exact in rendering these verbs: *conformed, transformed*. *Transfigured* (Five Ang. Clergymen) is more accurate, and reproduces, in a measure, the variety in the form of the Greek.

[4] Ver. 2.—[After νοός, the *Rec.* (ℵ. D[3]. L.) inserts ὑμῶν. It is omitted in A. B. D[1]. F.; rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Tregelles, Lange; probably a mechanical repetition from ver. 1.

[5] Ver. 2.—[This emendation accords with Dr. Lange's exegesis. It is taken from Noyes; the Amer. Bible Union gives a similar rendering.

[6] Ver. 3.—[The bracketted rendering is that of Alford, Wordsworth, &c.; but is, at best, a clumsy attempt to reproduce the play on the words ὑπερφρονεῖν, φρονεῖν, σωφρονεῖν.

[7] Ver 5.—[The reading of the *Rec.* (ὁ) is very poorly supported, though defended by Philippi on exegetical grounds. ℵ. A. B. D[1]. F. read τό; which is adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, and most. The clause contains a solecism, and means: *what* (is true) *as regards individuals*, (they are) *members of one another*.

[8] Ver. 6.—[The difficulties of construction are discussed fully in the *Exeg. Notes*. The E. V. has so happily filled out the elliptical clauses, and preserved the force of the original, that it is not necessary to make any alterations. The clause: *let us wait on our ministering* (ver. 7), might perhaps be improved; yet, on the whole, it presents the correct meaning.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary.—The practical theme controlling the whole of the second part. The proper conduct of Christians, or the calling of (Roman) Christians to the living worship (service) of God,* vers. 1, 2; *a.* The proper conduct toward the fellowship of believing brethren, the Church (ecclesiastical duties), vers. 3–8; *b.* The proper conduct of Christians in all personal relations, vers. 9–21; *c.* Toward civil authorities (duties toward the government), chap. xiii. 1–6; *d.* Toward the world in general. Recognition of the rights of the world, and of legal fellowship with it. Separation, on the contrary, from the ungodliness of the world, vers. 7–14; *e.* The proper practice of the living worship of God, and its universality in the removing of the differences between the "weak" and the "strong," chap. xiv. 1–xv. 4; *f.* Exhortation to unanimity of all the members of the Church to the praise of God, on the ground of God's grace, for realizing the destination of all nations to glorify God, chap. xv. 5–13.

See also the headings of the sections. Meyer: "General exhortation to holiness." But this "general" exhortation is very characteristically defined according to the characteristic, fundamental thought of the whole Epistle, in its *essential* as well as in its *personal* reference. According to the essential reference, the Apostle has shown, in the first part, that the corruption of the world consists in its having fallen from the living worship of God, and that therefore redemption is a restoration of the fundamental principles of this living worship. The entire holiness of Christians is, accordingly, portrayed as the development of a living spiritual worship. But in the personal reference, the Apostle shows how the Roman Christian congregation should be developed into a congregation of living worship, in order to be the instrument of its extension to all the world, to serve as a central organ for the Apostle, who has perceived his calling in the extension of this worship into all the world.

1. *The practical theme* (vers. 1, 2). A summons to develop the service restored by redemption. [Comp. here the third part of the Heidelberg Catechism, *On Thankfulness to God for Redemption*.—P. S.]

* [The word *Gottesdienst*, used here, and frequently throughout this section, means, literally: *Service of God;* but, technically: public service, Divine service, public worship. Dr. Lange seems to combine both meanings, for he implies that all the duties here set forth form not only a service of God, but the best, truest worship, the real liturgy of the New Testament Church.—R.]

Ver. 1. **I beseech you therefore, brethren** [Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί]. According to Meyer and Tholuck, the οὖν does not introduce an inference from the whole of the previous didactic part (as Calvin, Bengel, De Wette, Philippi, and others, would have it), but from chap. xi. 35, 36. But it must be observed, that the conclusion of chap. xi. constitutes the organic apex of the entire doctrinal division; this is especially true of ver. 32, with which Rückert, and others, would connect this verse. Tholuck fails to perceive the Apostle's practical theme, in saying: "The Apostle was accustomed to make some exhortations follow the chief, and therefore the didactic, contents."

By the mercies of God [διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ] (chap. xv. 30; 1 Cor. i. 10; 2 Cor. x. 1). The objective ground of Divine mercy in their experience of salvation, is made the subjective ground of his admonition. He refers to the experience of Divine mercy, its consequence, and its light and right, as if he said, *by the name* of Divine mercy. The only difference is, that, in the asseveration διά, *by*, the speaker allows the subject of his asseveration itself to speak as motive and motor. The plural οἰκτιρμοί corresponds to the Hebrew רַחֲמִים; but the Apostle has also instituted, in the foregoing, a threefold gradation of the Divine demonstration of grace.

To present, παραστῆσαι. The expression, which was used of placing the sacrificial beast before the altar, conveys the thought of the *complete resignation* and *readiness* which, on the one hand, does not in the least hesitate, but, on the other, makes no intrusion by an arbitrary slaying of the offering.

Your bodies [τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν]. The holding of the body in readiness for an offering well-pleasing to God, is the expression for the highest measure of the renunciation of every thing earthly and temporal. Explanations:

1. Figurative designation of personality itself, according to the figure of the offering (Beza, De Wette, and Philippi [Stuart, Hodge]).

2. *The bodies* in the real sense, as the holiness of the νοῦς is added in the second verse (Fritzsche, Meyer).

3. The sensuous nature of man, which leads him to sin (Köllner, and others).

Against (1.): The Apostle speaks, according to the apostolic standard, to believers, who, according to chap. vi., have already given their personal life to death. But the body is the organ and symbol of all the individual parts, which must be offered in consequence of this principial offering. Against

(2.), Coccejus: *Non possumus offerre corpus sine anima.* The real service performed in making the offering is, indeed, finished with the shedding of blood, or with the resignation of the body. But the heart, or the life of the spirit, is given to God as an expression that the body is offered. Against (3.) Whatever is sinful is not fit, as such, for an offering.—The body is the organ and symbol of the present life in all its relations and parts. Comp. chap. vi. 12, 13, where the question under consideration is the *active* consecration of all the members of the body.*

Sacrifice. θυσίαν. We hold that the Apostle has in mind the symbol of the central offering—that is, of the burnt-offering (comp. Tholuck, p. 651). But the burnt-offering was a symbol that the whole life, with all its powers, should be consumed in the fire of God's sovereignty, for His service and glory. The predicates, **living,** ζῶσαν, &c., particularly the first, which the Apostle ascribes to this θυσία, are thought, by Meyer, to denote the antithesis of this New Testament offering to that of the Old Testament: "as an offering *which lives* (antithesis to the real offerings which lose their life)." Tholuck, on the other hand, says with propriety: "the thought that in the Old Testament only dead offerings were brought to God, is neither Jewish nor Pauline; to present not only dead offerings, but even *sick* ones, was an abomination before the Lord; Mal. i. 8." Yet this applies only to Meyer's expression; his distinction in itself is well founded. The predicates, **holy** [ἁγίαν] **and well-pleasing to God** [εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ], do not in themselves fully constitute an antithesis to the Old Testament. The antithesis is comprised: (1.) In the designation, *your bodies, human bodies;* which is necessary to the idea of a spiritual offering; (2.) In the emphasis on the *presenting and holding in readiness* for the Lord, as the Finisher of the real offering; *in which all their own external self-offering on the part of the Roman Christians is absolutely precluded.* By this means the predicates acquire a stronger meaning. The higher and real newness of life, the holiness of, and Divine pleasure in, the life of faith given up to the service of God, take the place of the symbolical newness of life, holiness of, and legal Divine pleasure in, the offering of the beast. Estius, Bengel, and others, have connected the τῷ Θεῷ with παραστῆσαι; this is correctly opposed by Meyer and Tholuck (see Phil. iv. 18; comp. Rom. vi. 13; 1 Peter ii. 5).

Which is your rational service. [Dr. Lange: *Euer vernünftiger (geistiger) Gottesdienst.*] The accusative τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν is in apposition with the foregoing clause, characterizing more specifically what has been said, according to the New Testament conception of offering, in antithesis to that of the Old Testament. The λατρεία, *service, worship,* which, in its central idea, is everywhere an offering (see John xvi. 2). But this sacrificial worship of believers should be λογική (see John iv. 21; Rom. i. 9; 1 Peter ii. 5). The λογικόν denotes that which is inspired by reason, in harmony with real reason, and consequently *spiritual,* real; in antithesis to merely external symbolical service (Melanchthon, *cultus mentis*),* but not in antithesis to the ζῶα ἄλογα (Theodoret, Grotius, and others); for, as Meyer observes, the question here is λατρεία, but not θυσία. Indirectly, indeed, the λογικὴ λατρεία is also an antithesis to the *cultus commentitii;* for if the symbolical service would establish itself beyond its time, against the real service, it would then become *cultus commentitius.*

Ver. 2. **And not to be conformed.** On the difference of the readings, see *Textual Note* ². The infinitives must be referred to the παρακαλῶ. The συνσχηματίζεσθαι is passive, with a reflexive meaning, *in eandem formam redigi, se conformare.* Philippi: "The original difference between σχῆμα and μορφή may be, that the latter denotes rather the organic form, while the former denotes more the mechanical form, the external and adventitious *habitus* (σχῆμα from ἔχω, σχεῖν); comp. 1 Cor. vii. 31. Hence σχῆμα is also the external semblance, the *pompa,* and σχηματίζεσθαι, synonymous with προσποιεῖσθαι, *to assume a form,* a seeming shape, to appear, to take the shape of; comp. the passages cited by Wetstein; μορφή also the beautiful form, *forma;* comp. *formosus.* Thus μορφή more fitly designates the real inward form, while σχῆμα denotes rather the external and accidental appearance." Comp. Phil. ii. 6–8. See also Tholuck, p. 652. Meyer holds [as the E. V. assumes], that the antithesis of both verbs is comprised only in the prepositions; these, indeed, increase it. The σύν denotes the torpidity of the external form of the Church by uniformity with the world, worldliness; the μετά denotes the organic change and transformation of the organic shape, according to the new inward form. Meyer: "The present infinitives denote a continued action, while παραστῆσαι represents the presenting of the offering as a completed act."

To this world [τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ]. עוֹלָם הַזֶּה. The pre-messianic and relatively anti-messianic form of the world in its perverted course. [Comp. Lange's *Comm.*, Gal. i. 4, p. 13.—R.]

But to be transfigured [ἀλλὰ μεταμορφοῦσθαι. The difference in preposition and verb is better preserved by *transfigured,* which also conveys the distinctions suggested above. See Five Anglican Clergymen.—R.] The μεταμ. is reflexive, as συνσχ.

By the renewing of your mind; chap. vii. 24; Eph. iv. 23. The καινότης πνεύματος (Rom. vii. 6; comp. chap. vi. 4), as an impelling principle, results in the ἀνακαίνωσις of the νοῦς; for the νοῦς, the conscious, thoughtful, or reflective moral and religious spiritual life (disposition) is constantly renewed, in part restored, and in part developed, in its mastery over the natural part of life. The transformation and shaping of the life of the Christian are determined not by external worldly forms, but by this inward renewing, or renewing ascending to the whole of the external life (ἀνακαίνωσις) through the productive power of the Spirit. The νοῦς, as such, does not then receive the new μορφή (Tholuck), but rather the whole Christian life from the νοῦς outward.†

* [So Tholuck. While it must be admitted that we are bidden to present our entire selves, the choice of the word "bodies" is probably "an indication that the sanctification of Christian life is to extend to that part of man's nature which is most completely under the bondage of sin" (Alford). This view is not open to the objection urged above by Dr. Lange, and accords with Paul's use of σῶμα.—R.]

* [So Hodge, Stuart, and most. *Rational* is preferable to *reasonable,* because the latter conveys ordinarily the idea of something for which a good reason can be given, rather than the exact idea of λογικόν, *rational, vernünftig.*—R.]

† [The *mind* is renewed in the newness of the Spirit, and from within the transforming impulse proceeds to

That ye may prove. Literally: εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν. [Infinitive clause of design (Meyer).—R.] The Christian life should not receive its development by means of an external legislation, but by the inward one, which is directed by spiritual proving and self-determination (see Gal. vi. 4; Eph. v. 10; Phil. i. 10, and other passages). Meyer appropriately says: "In the unrenewed man this proving is altogether foreign to the activity of his conscience. Comp. Eph. v. 10." But with this there is also connected the *being able to prove* (Rückert, Köllner [Hodge, apparently]), although the actual proving is conjoined with it. Meyer: "The regenerate one proves by the verdict of his conscience, aroused and illuminated by the Spirit." The νόμος of the Spirit, the Christian principle of life, is an infinitude, whose explanation and concrete application to life is committed to the proving of Christian illumination and wisdom.*

The will of God [τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ]. That which is willed by God in every relation of life. The reference of the definitions τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον, as adjectives, to God's will (Vulgate, Chrysostom, the most of the early expositors, Luther, Rückert, &c.), is opposed, first of all, by the εὐάρεστον, but, in general, by the tautology that would be contained in the expression. Therefore Erasmus, Castalio, Tholuck, Meyer, and the most of the early commentators, have regarded the additions as a substantive apposition.

What is good, &c. We may ask whether a climax of three members is designed [Meyer], or whether we should render explicit that double relation of the good, by which, on the one hand, it is that which is well-pleasing to God, and, on the other, that which is perfect in itself, because it arises from the righteousness of faith, the principle of perfection. We prefer the latter rendering. The repetition of the article would, of course, not be necessary with the first interpretation.†

2. *The proper conduct of Christians toward the community of brethren for the establishment of a harmonious church-life* (vers. 3–8). Tholuck is correct in finding, in what follows, a reference to the different spheres of activity in the Church. Meyer speaks only of an exhortation to individual duties.‡

Ver. 3. **For I say** (say definitely). The γάρ is rendered *namely*, by Tholuck and Meyer. [Alford also takes it as resumptive.] First of all, *namely* appears as inappropriate as *for*. If it is the matter of the self-proving and self-determination of believers, how they should act toward each other, how can the Apostle lay down his precepts immediately afterward? The answer lies in the fact, that their subjective judgment should be subordinated to the known *objective* will of God. This requirement, that they should be certain as to whether their conduct corresponds to God's perfect will, is so great, that it causes the Apostle to lay down regulations for it. Therefore we may also translate the γάρ by *for*. The λέγειν is used in the sense of injunction.

Through the grace, &c. [διὰ τῆς χάριτος, κ.τ.λ.] Even here διά. He will not prescribe for them by virtue of his subjective opinion or authority, but by virtue of the grace which is given to him (see chap. i. 5), which establishes his office, and is at the same time the element of life common to his office and their church-life (see chap xv. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 10; Eph. iii. 7, 8).

To every man that is among you [παντὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν. Alford: "A strong bringing out of the *individual* application of the precept."—R.] This would therefore have applied to Peter also, if he had been in Rome, or Paul would not have spoken thus, or, indeed, would not have written to them at all.

Not to think of himself [μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν. See the text, and *Textual Note* °.—R.] Tholuck: φρονεῖν is here not "to strive after," and also not "to be disposed, to think," but "to think (of himself)" (see p. 654).

Soberly, σωφρονεῖν. It is wise conduct or good behavior, especially as moderation.—Proper self-knowledge and esteem, apart from over-estimation, should, by modesty, come to proper and wise moderation in the reciprocity of the personal life with the society. Meyer understands φρονεῖν as *to be disposed*, and explains the details accordingly; the Vulgate, Calvin, and others, interpret in the same way. The mode of thinking and feeling is undoubtedly connected here with the *holding and demeaning*, which is proved by the σωφρονεῖν

According as God hath dealt to every man [ἑκάστῳ ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐμέρισεν]. The ἑκάστῳ is dependent on ἐμέρισε: *According as God hath dealt to every man*, &c., is therefore made antecedent by inversion (see 1 Cor. iii. 5).—The idea of a different distribution of the measure of faith leads to the idea of the gift (ver. 6). No one should apply more than the gift of grace, for what lies beyond this is presumption; but the whole of the gift of grace should be applied, for if this be not done, something would be withheld from the society which is designed for it. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 4–6, 11; Heb. ii. 4.

The measure of faith [μέτρον πίστεως]. When Meyer maintains that faith here means only faith in the ordinary sense, he overlooks the fact that the *measure of faith* is spoken of in concrete unity; or rather, he interprets this measure erroneously, by understanding only different degrees of the strength of faith, and, accordingly, he not only rejects the reference of the expression to Christian knowledge (Beza, and others), or to the power of working miracles (Theophylact), but also to the gift of grace (Chrysostom, and most other commentators). The purely Divine element in the gift is undoubtedly emphasized here, for what is not of faith is sin. [Alford explains the phrase: "*The receptivity* of χαρίσματα, itself no inherent congruity. It is, in fact, the subjective designation of 'the grace that is given unto us;' ver. 6." He rightly distinguishes it from the gifts and graces themselves. So Philippi in substance. The objective sense of "faith," which is implied in the view of Beza, is open to decided objection.—R.]

Ver. 4. **For as we have many members in one body** [καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι

transfigure the whole life. This seems to be Dr. Lange's meaning.—R.]

* [The verb occurring here is rendered *discern* (Amer. Bible Union), *approve* (Erasmus, and others); but *prove*, test by actual experience, is to be preferred (so Meyer, De Wette, Alford, and others). Wordsworth: *assay* the value of.—R.]

† [The non-repetition of the article, which is urged against the "substantive apposition," is readily explained. It shows that all three refer to one thing. See Winer, p. 120.—R.]

‡ [So Alford. Meyer subdivides these verses thus: vers. 3–5, exhortation to humility in general; vers. 6–8, with special reference to official charisms.—R.]

πολλὰ μέλη ἔχομεν]. Establishment of the foregoing. The individual Christian is only a member of Christ's body, and should conduct himself *as a member*, avow himself as a member, and should permit himself to be strengthened as a member; Christ alone is the Head.* "On the commonness of the parallels between a human body and a *corpus sociale* (1 Cor. xii.), even among the ancients, see Grotius and Wetstein *in loco;*" Meyer.

Ver. 5. **So we, being many.** In antithesis to the unity of the body.

In Christ. The head is the organic vital centre of the whole, in which (not *to* which) every thing in respect to dominion and glory is comprised (Eph. i. 22, and other passages).

And every one. Τὸ δὲ καθ' εἷς is a solecism of the later Greek, instead of τὸ δὲ καθ' ἕνα; Mark xiv. 19; John viii. 9, and other passages.

Ver. 6. **Having then gifts differing according to the grace** [ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα]. Different constructions here enter into consideration.

1. With ἔχοντες a new sentence begins, which continues in a succession of elliptical exhortations (Beza, Olshausen, Philippi, and others). Meyer: "The elliptical expression after κατὰ τὴν ἀναλ. τ. πίστ. may be supplied by προφητεύωμεν; by ὦμεν after ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ; by ἔστω after ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ; by the same after ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει; and, finally, by the imperatives of the corresponding verbs (μεταδιδότω, &c.) after the three following parts, ἐν ἁπλότητι, &c. [So E. V., Hodge, &c.] Comp. the analogous mode of expression in 1 Peter iv. 10 f.

2. The ἔχοντες is connected with the foregoing, but in such a way that the following clauses are, according to Meyer, all ellipses (Erasmus, and others). Meyer also places Tholuck here, but Tholuck declares now for (1.).

3. The ἔχοντες δὲ is joined with ἐσμεν (ver. 5), in appositional meaning, and the following clauses are, at the outset, not hortatory, but descriptive, yet pass over into the hortatory (Reiche, Rückert, De Wette, Lachmann). We accept this construction with the modification, that we construe the ἔχειν emphatically in the meaning of *to have and to hold fast, to put into practice, to exercise.* Comp. Rom. i. 28. With the gifts, as with every thing spiritual, we must bear especially in mind that they cannot be possessed aright without exercising them. Thus the hortatory character under the descriptive form lies in the force of the ἔχειν, and in the added δέ. [This δέ is rendered by Alford: "and not only so, but."—R.]

As for the apparent fluctuations in the construction, they resolve themselves into regular forms, if we observe the subdivisions.† The Apostle distinguishes, first of all, two principal categories: *a.* προφητεία; *b.* διακονία. The διακονία is then divided into the διδάσκων and the παρακαλῶν; this latter is again divided into the μεταδιδούς, the προϊστάμενος, and the ἐλεῶν. This is proved by the forms:

1. The antithesis of the abstract nouns, προφητεία and διακονία. The latter, in its broader meaning, was evidently a church office; while, on the other hand, the προφητεία was, in the fullest sense, also an office.

2. εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων, εἴτε ὁ παρακαλῶν. This παρακαλῶν must, at all events, be regarded as a superintendent of the society, presbyter, or man having the gifts of the presbyter, whether, as ὁ μεταδιδούς, he devoted himself to the care of the poor; as ὁ προϊστάμενος, to the κυβέρνησις in the narrower sense; or, as ὁ ἐλεῶν, to the healing of the sick and casting out of devils.*—*Gifts differing according to the grace. Gifts;* that is, modifications of the one Divine grace in the differences of the human individual talent (see 1 Cor. xii. 4 ff.).

Whether prophecy. Prophecy, in the Old Testament as well as in the New, is the gift and calling to declare, by the prompting and communication of God's Spirit, what is *new*—that which concerns the future, and the development of God's kingdom; in order, like the compass, to direct aright, in the present, the ship of the kingdom. The reason why it appears more in the foreground in the Old Testament than in the New, is, that the former was the time of expectation and longing, and the latter the time of fulfilment and satisfaction.†

According to the proportion (harmony) **of faith** [κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως]. The expression defines exactly: according to the relation, the proportion, or harmony of faith; that is, according to the proportion defined by faith. Explanations:

1. Subjective faith, including the *measure of faith*, is meant (the early commentators; Origen, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and others; Bengel and Meyer [Alford, De Wette]. Tholuck: "The prophet keeps within the limits of his prophetical gift, assigned him by his individuality").

2. The objective rule of faith (Abelard, Aquinas, Hervæus, &c.; Flatt, Klee, Philippi, and others). Tholuck, on the contrary, observes, that we may ask whether Paul could have appealed already to such a *regula fidei*. But, in reality, Moses has already established the features of the *analogia fidei*, Deut. xviii. 18 ff. It is well known that the

* [Alford: "γάρ, elucidating the fact that God apportions variously to various persons: because the Christian community is like a *body*, with many members, having various duties."—R.]

† [Tholuck: "The first two accusatives are grammatically dependent on ἔχοντες: by degrees the Apostle loses sight of this construction, and continues with the concrete ὁ διδάσκων, which he still binds on to the foregoing with εἴτε; but, at ὁ μεταδιδούς, omits this also, and, at ver. 9, introduces the abstract ἡ ἀγάπη." This view or that of Dr. Lange will be preferred, as one does or does not seek definiteness of arrangement in the verses.—R.]

* [Dr. Lange's classification is ingenious, and perhaps the most satisfactory one, if all seven terms be referred to official positions. Meyer, Alford, and others, refer the last three (in ver. 8) to persons endowed with certain charisms, without any special official position. The reason for this change in application is found in the omission of εἴτε, the difficulty of referring these to official persons and functions, the change in the admonitions, which do not define the sphere, as before, but the mode. Besides, as the Apostle (ver. 4) has been speaking of "all members," he would naturally allude to others than official persons. See further in the notes on the separate clauses.—R.]

† ["Prophecy" undoubtedly includes more than the prediction of future events, yet the tendency has been to identify the New Testament prophet with the preacher. Dr. Hodge remarks: "The gift of which Paul here speaks, is . . . that of immediate occasional inspiration, leading the recipient to deliver, as the mouth of God, the particular communication which he had received." This view, which is undoubtedly correct, removes this office out of the discussions respecting Church polity and offices at the present day. It belongs to the extraordinary gifts of the apostolic age.—R.]

Jews crucified Christ by a false application of this rule; but it is equally well known that the New Testament proofs of faith from the Old Testament, which first introduced Christianity into the Jewish world, have only been a living application of this rule. At all events, Paul could not yet appeal to ecclesiastical confessions, but he could appeal to a fundamental canon of truth; see Gal. i. 8; vi. 16; Phil. iii. 16; 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, &c. However, Tholuck has other grounds for preferring the explanation, that the prophet keeps within the sphere of his calling; namely, because the deacon should remain within the sphere of his diaconate, &c. But is the sphere of the prophet described by the measure of his subjective faith, or would not this be here rather a nugatory generality?* The sphere of the prophet, who reveals what is new for the enlargement of the old revelation, is just the real character of the revelation itself, harmonizing with itself through all the stages of development. Yet the Apostle does not say ἀποκαλύψεως, but πίστεως, because the faith of the Church is also called to the office of watchman, in order that the development of the truth be not corrupted by false prophets. The application of this rule to the exposition of the Scriptures in the early period (see Tholuck, p. 664) is not *explicatio*, but *applicatio*; but it cannot be denied that this *applicatio* itself is made κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως.

Ver. 7. **Or ministry** [εἴτε διακονίαν, *das Dienstamt* (Lange). Governed by ἔχοντες, like the preceding accusative]. A threefold idea of the διακονία can be distinguished in the New Testament. 1. The most comprehensive idea understands by διακονία the ecclesiastical office in general; see 1 Cor. xii. 5. There, prophecy is designated as a diaconate; here, it is distinguished from it. 2. Therefore, the special office for a definite congregation. So here. [Dr. Lange apparently includes here all the *permanent* offices in a single church, as he makes διακονία a category, under which the five following terms fall. If, however, it be considered as coördinate with what follows, then the still more restricted view must be adopted.—R.] 3. The diaconate, in distinction from the presbyterial episcopacy, 1 Tim. iii. 8. At the time when this Epistle was written, the ecclesiastical distinctions were less developed than when the First Epistle to Timothy was written, but yet more so than in the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

Let us wait on our ministering [ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ. We must supply an imperative, either *let us be in*, *remain in*, or *wait on* (as E. V.). The sense is the same.—R.] Meyer thus explains the ἐν: The one who was "diaconally endowed" shall not wish to be of authority beyond the sphere assigned him by this endowment, but to be active within it. But it is not necessary to understand the εἶναι ἐν quantitatively; it can also be understood qualitatively. And since all the apostolic functions of the Church were diaconal, qualitative ministering is undoubtedly the meaning. The proof of the true office is, that it consists simply in service; just as, inversely, pure divine service becomes the true office, even if it had no human official seal. With the positive filling of his sphere, it is always supposed that he does not commit improprieties beyond his sphere.

Or he that teacheth, on teaching [εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ]. According to Meyer, Paul should have continued uniformly, εἴτε διδασκαλίαν (sc. ἔχοντες), "as [Cod.] A. actually has." We have seen, in the arrangement of the gifts (see above), what grounds he had for not thus continuing.* Thus he has his gift in his *labors as teacher*. This appears self-evident; but how many, who would be deemed teachers, are mere babblers!

Ver. 8. **Or he that exhorteth, on exhortation** [ὁ παρακαλῶν, ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει]. As the παρακαλῶν here is definitely distinguished from the διδάσκων, nothing else can be understood by it than a fraction within the more general presbyterate. Evidently the more definite distinction, in 1 Tim. v. 17, between presbyters who devote themselves to teaching, and ruling presbyters, thus begins to take shape; while, on the other hand, the diaconate is developed in a presbyterate from the date of Acts xi. 30, and has not yet positively been separated from it. The exhorter, according to what follows, comprises the different sides of the subsequently developed presbyterial office; he is undoubtedly synonymous with the pastors, Eph. iv. 11. The division of his office appears in the following statements.†

He that giveth [ὁ μεταδιδούς]. According to Meyer, the official functions to the Church cease with the εἴτε. We have, on the contrary, laid down further subdivisions here. Every Christian is indeed a μεταδιδούς, and not less an ἐλεῶν; but as here there stands midway between the two a προϊστάμενος, which not every one can be, special functions recognized by the Church are evidently meant. Meyer argues against such functions, by observing: *a*. The diaconal gift could not be thus analyzed; *b*. The position of the προϊστάμενος as the presbyter between two deaconal employments, would be inappropriate. Instead, therefore, of bearing in mind the growing relations, he does violence to them by preconceived opinions; a presbyter is a presbyter, a deacon is a deacon, &c.; and then, ac-

* [Alford (with most modern commentators) defends the subjective view of "faith," from the context, "which aims at showing that the measure of faith, itself the gift of God, is the receptive faculty for all spiritual gifts, which are therefore not to be boasted of, nor pushed beyond their provinces, but humbly exercised within their own limits." Besides, there is very little warrant for the objective sense of πίστις; it was unknown to the early Greek fathers (Meyer), and cannot be established as a New Testament *usus*; comp. Lange's *Comm. Gal.* i. 23, p. 27; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, pp. 152 ff. It would seem, then, that the technical theological phrase: *analogy of faith*, has a meaning not strictly in accordance with Paul's use of the phrase. Certainly the application is quite different—here, to the extraordinary gift of prophecy; theologically, to a *regula fidei*. Dr. Lange seems to take middle ground.—R.]

* [The change to the nominative is deemed by Dr. Lange a sufficient warrant for taking this, and the corresponding participle which follows, as directly subordinate to the idea expressed in διακονίαν. If a reason must be found for the irregularities of the Apostle's syntax, this is the simplest and most satisfactory explanation.—R.]

† [Meyer confines the charisms of exclusively official significance to the four terms already discussed, though he thinks these four are examples chosen out of a larger number: (1.) The gift of *theopneustic discourse*, prophecy. (2.) The gift of oversight of the external affairs of the Church, *diaconate*. (3.) The gift of teaching by ordinary methods, not yet limited to any special office. (4.) The gift of exhortation, *i. e.*, of encouraging or admonitory remarks upon the passage of Scripture read after the usage of the synagogue. This last differs from the teaching, in being directed to the heart and will; while teaching was directed to the understanding. Philippi, whose notes are very full and valuable, agrees with him in the main, but differs from him in regard to what follows.—R.]

cording to him, Paul casts the presbyter right in the midst of the membership.*

With simplicity. This term is characteristic of the penetration of the Apostle, since accessory views might be easily connected with all exercise of beneficence.†

He that ruleth, προϊστάμενος. According to Meyer, the presbyter, but not the presbyter exclusively. See 1 Cor. xii. 28. The order there laid down by the apostles is as follows: 1. Prophets; 2. Teachers; 3. Miraculous powers; then healing of the sick, then bestowals of help, then κυβερνήσεις, and finally γένη γλωσσῶν. Therefore the bestowals of help would thus fall under the rubric of the present παρακαλῶν, and especially of the μεταδιδούς. Undoubtedly the κυβερνήσεις there stands in the same line with the προϊστάμενος here. The ones concerned as having care of the external affairs of the Church, had, at the beginning, no great things to manage. We then find the parallel of the ἐλεῶν in the gift of specific miracles: the healing of those possessed with devils, and the restoration of the sick.‡

With diligence. Σπουδή may mean *haste*, *zeal*, or *diligence*. But the latter idea is most definite; zeal was a common duty of all.

With cheerfulness [ἐν ἱλαρότητι, *i. e.*, hilarity]. "With gladness and friendliness," says Meyer, "the opposite of unwilling and ill-humored behavior." But the question here is not a conventional good conduct, but that cheerfulness from heaven which, in a despondent world, among other duties, must conquer and banish the demons of sadness.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. On chap. xii. 1 ff. As man's ideal destination was to perceive God aright in His works, and to praise and glorify Him, and, accordingly, the fall consisted in the omission of this living worship, according to Rom. i. 20, 21; then, as human corruption consisted fundamentally in the false worship of heathen idolatry and of Jewish zeal for the letter, according to chaps. i. and ii.; as, further, redemption was instituted that God might effect and manifest the real atonement in Christ as the mercy-seat of the Holy of Holies sprinkled with His own blood, according to chap. iii. 25; as then, consequently, also Christian saving faith consisted (according to chap. v. 1, 2) of free access to God into the Holy of Holies, and is developed in the most varied features of a New Testament call to worship; so, according to the practical part of this Epistle, should believers begin the development of their worship (chap. xii. 1), by finishing the real *burnt-offering* by the pure presentation of their own bodily life to God's service. On the passages of heathen and Jewish wise men relating to the moral consecration to God as a self-offering, quoted in Wetstein and Koppe, see Meyer, p. 453. See the same author on the "rational service," p. 453; Tholuck, p. 651 ff.; Philippi, p. 500. It is noteworthy that the "rational service" is recommended to the *Roman* Church. On the συσχηματίζεσθαι and μεταμορφοῦσθαι, see the *Exeg. Notes*. On αἰὼν οὗτος, see Philippi, p. 202.

2. Just as the First Epistle of Peter appears as an evangelical prophecy, in opposition to the later false image of Peter, so is it with the Epistle to the Romans; and especially does the expression of the living offering and the reasonable service stand in opposition to the later picture of the life of the Romish Church. The same assertion holds good of the expression with which Paul prescribes for *all* Christians in Rome, that every one should not think too highly of himself, that we are all members one of another, &c.

3. The first application which the Christian has to make of the principle of his new life is, that he should not arrogantly abuse his charism [gift] in a hierarchical or sectarian way, but should exercise it purely for the service of the Church, by adapting himself to the requirements of the community, and yet preserve his evangelical freedom. The rule is: (1.) The whole gift for the Church; (2.) Nothing but the gift; see 1 Cor. xii. On the idea of the charism, see the *Exeg. Notes;* also Tholuck, p. 655 ff.; p. 661.—The difference between the ἐλεῶν and him that giveth, applies to an early period in the Church. The support of the poor brethren in the first period was not the alms of charity. On the disposition and character of the increasing offices in the Church, see the *Exeg. Notes*. For fuller information on the gifts, see my *Gesch. des apostol. Zeitalters*, p. 555 ff.; and on the offices, p. 535 ff.

4. The defective understanding, which is still apparent in many ways, in reference to the rule that prophecy is according to the measure of faith, arises from the want of perception of the lawfulness of organic development in the department of spiritual as well as of natural life. With the lawfulness of development there is combined the development of lawfulness in all the spheres of life. But in the ecclesiastical department of faith, many will know nothing of the development expressed in prophecy, and, in contrast to them, many will know nothing of the lawfulness expressed by the measure of faith. Hence arise such foolish, noisy decisions of the day as this: The confessions of the Church are no longer obligatory! Every one must know what is obligatory *for him*, according to his own conscience and calling. But no one has any right to deny the validity of what the Church of God, in its real development of life, regards as its duty. At all events, it follows most from the Apostle's rule, that the mean

* [Meyer guards against this position, by making the gift a general one, not exclusively that of presbyter or ἐπίσκοπος. Hodge and Philippi, however, refer the first and third to Christians generally, and the second to the ecclesiastical rulers. The latter defends such a promiscuous arrangement as warranted by the Apostle's purpose. It may be observed, that διαδούς would better express official beneficence, while μεταδούς, it is claimed by many, refers to private giving of one's own substance.—R.]

† [Tholuck and Alford render: *with liberality;* but this seems to be but poorly supported. Dr. Hodge retains the common meaning in the case of the deacons, and adds: "Considered in reference to private Christians, this clause may be rendered, *he that giveth, with liberality.*" But this is only an inference. The Apostle says: *with simplicity*, which is as difficult in the case of private as of official beneficence.—R.]

‡ [It is evident how difficult it is to deduce from the hints given in these Epistles, written to different Churches at different times, any consistent theory of Church government during the apostolic age. In regard to this particular word, most commentators refer it to "the rulers"—*i. e.*, the ruling elders; but the great objection is, that so important an office would scarcely be put in the position it here occupies. Meyer formerly held that it meant those who entertained strangers (so Stuart, in an excursus on this passage), but he has abandoned this view. Alford refers it to ruling in the household, &c. In favor of the common view, it may well be urged, however, that the Churches grafted on the synagogue did have such officers, and we might expect a reference to them here. If referred to at all, it must be by this word.—R.]

ing of confessions is thoroughly dependent on the meaning of the Holy Scriptures. But then it may be asked, whether a legal development has been committed to the Church in its essential and substantial life, or whether the custom of declaiming against the boundless culpability of the Church, now in doctrine and now in life, has arisen because the tradition of bishops' caps and doctors' hats is regarded as the most exact history of the Church.

[5 *On church polity*, as taught in this section. The most remarkable fact is, that so little is said. The doctrines of grace are fully treated; the practical theme is distinctly announced. Then, *after an exhortation to humility*, comes an exhortation apparently to church officers, yet so indistinct in its distinctions that nothing definite as to the usages of the Roman Church can be based upon it. A warning against the hierarchy of Rome can readily be found in it; but is it not also suggestive of a certain "freedom of adaptation" in the external polity of Christ's Church? To one who has puzzled over this and parallel passages with the honest purpose of finding out what is the form of church government given *jure divino*, and failed to discover, in any present form, the counterpart of the apostolic Church, it gives a happy relief from perplexity to conclude that church polity was purposely sketched by the apostles only in "*silhouette;*" that the details are to be of ecclesiastical rather than of Divine enactment; that, while despotism and anarchy are excluded, both by the nature of the case and the hints given in the New Testament, the external form of the Church of the future may be as different from any organization at present existing, as its spirit will transcend that of mere ecclesiasticism. Mayhap, when the Church shall return to the apostolical spirit, it will find in its outward form the true exegesis of these disputed passages. He who reads prelacy here, reads through colored glasses; and he who finds ruling elders alluded to, must first derive his knowledge of their existence from other sources, and then make his exegesis correspond. If, however, any will not be satisfied until a *jure divino* form is found, a search into later Epistles will be more profitable; yet that fact of itself admits development in the apostolic age, and who shall say when that development shall cease? Comp. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, i. pp. 130 ff., and the list of authors there referred to; also a discussion on Lay and Primitive Eldership, in the *Amer. Presbyterian Review*, Drs. R. D. Hitchcock and E. F. Hatfield, vol. vi. pp. 253-268, 506-531.—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[In the original, the Homiletical Notes are inserted at the close of the chapter.—R.]

Vers. 1, 2. Our thank-offering for God's mercy. 1. What sort of a sacrifice should it be? *a.* Living; *b.* Holy; *c.* Well-pleasing to God. 2. With what disposition should it be presented? *a.* Not so that we should conform to the world, and therefore not with unconverted hearts; but, *b.* That our minds should be renewed, that we may continually perceive God's will aright.—Our rational service. 1. The *sacrifice* which is presented, is not the sacrifice of slain beasts, but the living sacrifice of our bodies. 2. The *sanctuary* is not the tabernacle or temple, but the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ. 3. The *priests* are not Levites, but all believing Christians whose mind is renewed.—The restoration of rational service was a prime advantage conferred by our Reformers.—How rational service, in conformity with its nature, should not be limited to the celebration of Sundays and holy days, but should embrace the whole life.—The exhortation to rational service is still necessary. 1. In opposition to the Catholic Church; 2. In opposition to certain sects.—Paul exhorts to reasonable worship, but not to the worship of reason.—Reasonable service is not subtilizing service. 1. The former is living and inspiring; 2. The latter, dead and cold.

LUTHER: St. Paul here calls all offerings, works, and worship, unreasonable, when performed without faith and the knowledge of God.—The law has a sacrifice of many kinds of irrational beasts, all of which are combined in one sacrifice, in order that we ourselves may become reasonable men.

STARKE: Nothing so urges us to what is good as the sense of God's sweet grace and mercy.—The death of the old man is the life of the new man; where Adam's wrath ceases, Christ's meekness begins; and where Adam's pride goes down, Christ's humility rises.—CRAMER: The Christians of the New Testament are spiritual priests, and bound to sacrifices, but they should sacrifice themselves: laying their obedience (1 Sam. xv. 22), their lips (Hosea xiv. 3), faith (Phil. ii. 17), alms (Phil. iv. 18), mercy (Hosea vi. 6), and all such things, on Jesus Christ, the golden altar, God will accept them.

SPENER: It is not enough to do good and leave evil undone, but the Christian must present himself a complete sacrifice to God.—If, in short, we would know at what we should aim in Christianity, it is the Divine will, and therefore the Divine word. Whatever this forbids must be evil, though even the whole world should permit and praise it; and whatever it enjoins is good, though it should be displeasing to every one.—BENGEL: They very improperly shirk from this perfect will who are always in search of what they, as they think, are at liberty to do without sin. But their course is just like that of a voyager, who, having lost his reckoning, is constantly in search of the most distant shore (ver. 2).

ROOS: God wills every thing that is good, every thing that is well-pleasing to Him, and every thing that is perfect. That is good which harmonizes with God's commandments; and it is good (καλόν) in so far as it is well-pleasing to Him; and it is perfect if presented to the extent of our capacity (ver. 2).

GERLACH: The Apostle *compares* the *worship of Christians* in spirit and in truth (John iv. 24), which he accordingly calls reasonable (comp. 1 Peter ii. 2), with the *typical* and *figurative* sacrificial worship of the Old Testament (vers. 1, 2).

HEUBNER: The love and mercy of God should be the incentive and source of the Christian sense. This constitutes the characteristic difference between Christian piety and every other kind: it flows from faith and the experience of Divine love in Christ.—The mutual devotedness of God and pious people.—The holiness of the first commandment.—Christian faith is the foundation of Christian piety (ver. 1).—Mastery over the fashion of the world: love for God, and the wish to have only His grace, conquers.—Proper and improper accommodation to circumstances.—Christian life must be something in motion, otherwise it will stink. *Accipiunt vitium, ni moveantur, aquæ.*

BESSER: A Christian man presents his body as

a daily offering, when he, 1. Crucifies that which impedes the spirit willing for God's service; 2. When he offers all the powers of his body and soul for God's honor and his neighbor's good (ver. 1).—Our service is *reasonable* ("logical") when it consists in Christian self-sacrifice, because this service is worthy of God, and well-pleasing to Him; just as the pure milk of the gospel (1 Peter ii. 2) is called reasonable (sincere) because it is the proper nourishment for God's children.—PAUL SPERATUS preached at Vienna, from this apostolical text, his powerful Reformation sermon on "The Glory of the reasonable Gospel Worship, and the Punishment of the unreasonable Popish Worship" (ver. 1).—We should flee from *conformity to the world* (ver. 2).

Vers. 3–8. Humility as the fundamental law of reasonable service in the Church. 1. It should show itself in no one's thinking too highly of himself, but in every one's thinking soberly of himself. 2. It should be manifested by patient consecration of gifts to the service of the Church (vers. 3–8).—True Christian humility: 1. Its nature; 2. Its source (ver. 3).—The figure of the body and the members; comp. 1 Cor. xii. (vers. 4, 5).—Healthy church-life. To this belong two things: 1. Unity in Christ; 2. Diversity of gifts (vers. 4–8).—Proof of the necessary connection of unity and diversity in the Church. 1. Unity without diversity is death; 2. Diversity without unity is disorder (vers. 4–8).—The gift of prophecy. 1. In what does it consist? 2. What purpose should it serve? Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 3 (ver. 7).—Has any one an office, let him wait on his office. This is said, first of all, of the special care of the poor (διακονία); but then it applies to every office (ver. 7).—What belongs to waiting on our teaching? 1. The appropriation of the material for teaching. 2. Observation of the proper mode of teaching (method). 3. The consecration of our own persons (ver. 7).—We should give with simplicity—that is: 1. From an unselfish heart; 2. With a single eye (Matt. vi. 22); 3. With a pure hand (ver. 8).—Proper care in government. 1. It protects order; 2. It regards freedom (ver. 8).—Christian mercy. 1. Its nature; 2. Its exercise (ver. 8).

LUTHER: However precious be all prophecy which leads to works, and not simply to Christ, as our comfort, it is nevertheless not like faith; since those who practise it seek the revelation of hobgoblins, and masses, pilgrimages, fasts, and the worship of saints (ver. 7).—Let those be taught who do not know it, and those be admonished who know it already (vers 7, 8).

STARKE: Man—a little world; such a glorious, artistic masterpiece of the Almighty Creator, that it cannot be too much contemplated and wondered at (ver. 4).—If you are appointed to the office of preacher, take your hand from the oxen, from the plough, and from your worldly business! Every one to the work to which God has assigned him! Sirach xxxviii. 25 (ver. 8).—CRAMER: Let no one think that he knows, and can do, every thing alone. If that had been designed, God would only have created one member to the body; Prov. xxii. 2 (ver. 4).—The proper touchstone of all exposition of the Holy Scriptures, is the constant and impregnable harmony of the writings of the prophets and apostles; Acts xxvi. 22 (ver. 7).—HEDINGER: Not out of the nest! How will you fly without feathers, judge without understanding, boast without a reason, be called pious without proof, be skilful without God? God does every thing, and you nothing. Therefore glorify Him, but not yourself. Be still and humble (ver. 3).—Listen! You are your neighbor's servant. Happy he, who, as the servant of his neighbor, lives in love (ver. 4).—Many rules, little work. What may it be? Great cry, little wool. Perform your office well, and regard yourself as unworthy of praise and reward (ver. 7).—MÜLLER. Teaching instructs and lays the foundation, exhortation builds upon the foundation (ver. 8).

SPENER: God has given one kind of faith to all—that is, as far as the matter itself is concerned. Therefore Peter says: They who have obtained *lik* (ἰσότιμον) precious faith with us (2 Peter i. 1) Therefore we must regard ourselves, mutually, as members of one body (ver. 3).—On ver. 7: Here belong preaching and *catechetical instruction* (characteristic of SPENER).

ROOS: Every one should act according to the proportion of his faith, and especially deliver Divine truths—that is, prophesy. That which is beyond them is the work of nature, and is worth nothing (ver. 4).—To the words, "he that teacheth," and "he that exhorteth," &c., we must mentally add, "because he has received his gift to do it from the Lord." Now he should exercise himself in this employment (vers. 7–9).

GERLACH: True *humility* is, to be conscious of what God gives to it; and it is not a self-acquired possession, but a free gift, and therefore is most intimately one with sobriety and clearness of spirit; while false patience, with an apparently deep self-humiliation, gives man a sullen look at his own heart, and in his gloom it increases the dark spirit of selfishness and pride (ver. 3).—The gift of *prophecy* should not draw the Christian into the sphere of obscure feelings, where he can no longer distinguish the truth revealed by God from the imaginations of his own mind, but should have a guiding star and rule of conduct for common Christian faith (ver. 7).

HEUBNER: God has given us, in the human body, an eloquent picture of human society, and of the inward union of all men. [Comp. the address of Menenius Agrippa to the people *in monte sacro*, Livy ii. 32] (vers. 4–6).—The sense of ver. 7 is: Let no one manifest or affect more fervency or enthusiasm than he has, according to the measure of his faith, according to the degree of his strength and religious conviction. How common it is for one to wish to appear more than he is, or can be! Even religion is brought out for a show, and perverted to a desire to please (ver. 7).—Nothing beyond the Christian's office is required of him; that is the first thing for him.—Christian fidelity to office as the fruit of faith (ver. 7).

BESSER: It is very important to distinguish the measure of faith, and yet not to separate from the measure of gifts (ver. 3).—To prophesy, means to declare God's mysteries, impelled by the Holy Spirit (ver. 7).—The prophecy of an unbelieving preacher and expositor can, indeed, resemble faith; but we pray the Lord for prophets whose measure of faith holds the rule of faith alive within them, who preach with hearts believing according to the received measure of faith, the faith which the Church confesses (ver. 7).

THE PERICOPES. Vers. 1–6 *for the first Sunday after Epiphany*. HEUBNER: The sacred obligations of the Christian as a member of a holy community.—Every Christian should be a minister. 1 Proof; 2. Blessing.—Christian piety. 1. Its nature 2. Its effects.—BUDDEUS: The real fruits of faith

They are shown: 1. In true service, or proper conduct toward God; 2. In proper conduct toward the world; and, 3. In proper conduct toward ourselves. —KAPFF: What is necessary for the offering of a sacrifice well-pleasing to God? 1. That we should no longer seek salvation in ourselves or in the world; 2. That we should fully appropriate Christ as the perfect sacrifice; 3. That we should wholly surrender ourselves to the perfect will of God.—STANDT: How far a true Christian must alienate himself from the world. 1. As a sacrifice on the Lord's altar; 2. As a work of the Lord's hand; 3. As a member of the Lord's body.—BURK: The Christian's life a daily priestly service. 1. In the feeling which pervades him; 2. In the denial which he exercises; 3. In the service which he renders.

[BISHOP HALL, on ver. 2: *Sermon on the fashions of the world.* Outline: I. The world. II. The forbidden fashions. 1. The head. 2. The eyes: (1.) The adulterous eye; (2). The covetous eye; (3.) The proud eye; (4.) The envious eye. 3. The forehead—the seat of impudence. 4. The ear: (1.) The deaf ear; (2.) The itching ear. 5. The tongue: (1.) The false tongue; (2.) The malicious tongue; (3.) The ribaldrous tongue. 6. The palate, or belly. 7. The back. 8. The neck and shoulders. 9. The heart. 10. The hands and feet. III. The ugliness and disgustiveness of worldly fashions in God's sight.

[FARINDON, on ver. 6: *On the proportion of faith.* Plato, when asked what God does in heaven, how He busies and employs himself there, how He passes away eternity, answered: "He works geometrically." So is the "proportion of faith," as St. Paul calls it, also geometrical; where we must not compare sum with sum, as they do in a market, or value the gift more or less by telling it; but argue thus: "As what He bestows is in proportion to his estate, so is what I bestow unto mine." And in this sense, the widow's two mites were recorded as a more bountiful and a larger present than if Solomon had thrown the wealth of his kingdom into the treasury. It was the faith, therefore, from which their liberality proceeded, which cheered the Apostle in all his distresses; not the gift itself.

[LEIGHTON, on ver. 1: *On the sacrifice of the godly.* The children of God delight in offering sacrifices to Him; but if they might not know that they were well taken at their hands, it would discourage them much. How often do the godly find it their experience, that, when they come to pray, He welcomes them, and gives them such evidence of His love as they would not exchange for all worldly pleasures! And when this doth not appear as at other times, they ought to believe it. He accepts themselves and their ways when offered in sincerity, though never so mean; though they sometimes have no more than a sigh or a groan, it is most properly a spiritual sacrifice.

[JEREMY TAYLOR: Religion teaches us to present to God our bodies as well as our souls; for God is the Lord of both; and if the body serves the soul in actions natural, and civil, and intellectual, it must not be eased in the only offices of religion, unless the body shall expect no portion of the rewards of religion, such as are resurrection, reunion, and glorification.

[CHARNOCK, on ver. 1: God, who requires of us a reasonable service, would work upon us by a reasonable operation. God therefore works by way of a spiritual illumination of the understanding, in propounding the creature's happiness by arguments and reasons, and in a way of a spiritual impression upon the will, moving it sweetly to the embracing that happiness, and the means to it, which He proposes: and, indeed, without this work preceding, the motion of the will could never be regular.

[J. HOWE, on ver. 1: *Sermon on self-dedication.* I. Explanation of the terms in the text. II. How the act enjoined must be performed. 1. With knowledge and understanding; 2. With serious consideration; 3. With a determined judgment that it ought to be done; 4. With liberty of spirit; 5. With full bent of heart and will; 6. With concomitant acceptance of God; 7. With explicit reference to Christ; 8. With deep humility and self-abasement; 9. With joy and gladness of heart; 10. With candor and simplicity; 11. With full surrender to God; 12. With solemnity. III. Inducements to self-dedication.

[BISHOP HOPKINS, on ver. 2: *On God's will.* This is all contained in the Holy Scriptures, which are a perfect system of precepts given us for the government of our lives here, and for the attaining of eternal life hereafter; and therefore it is likewise called His revealed will; whereas the other, namely, the will of purpose, is God's secret will, until it be manifested unto us by the events and effects of it.—To be governed by our own or other men's wills, is usually to be led by passion, and blind, headlong affections; but to give up ourselves wholly to the will of God, is to be governed by the highest reason in the world; for His will cannot but be good, since it is the measure and rule of goodness itself; for things are said to be good because God wills them. And whatsoever He requires of us is pure and equitable, and most agreeable to the dictates of right and illuminated reason; so that we act most like men when we act most like Christians, and show ourselves most rational when we show ourselves most religious.—J. F. H.]

Second Section.—*The proper conduct of Christians in all their personal relations: to the brethren in their own life; to the needy; to guests; to every body, even toward enemies.*

Chap. XII. 9–21.

9 *Let* love be without dissimulation [*your* love be unfeigned]. Abhor[1] that
10 which is evil; cleave to that which is good. *Be* kindly affectioned one to
another with brotherly love [In brotherly love[2] be affectionate one to another,
11 *literally*, be as blood relatives]; in honour preferring one another; Not slothful in
business [In diligence, not slothful]; fervent in spirit [in spirit, fervent]; serv-
12 ing the Lord [*or*, the time];[3] Rejoicing in hope [in hope, rejoicing]; patient in
tribulation [in tribulation, patient]; continuing instant in prayer [in prayer,
13 persevering]; Distributing [Communicating] to the necessity [necessities][4] of
14 saints; given to hospitality. Bless them which [those who] persecute you:
15 bless, and curse not. Rejoice with them that do [those who] rejoice, and weep
16 with them that [those who] weep. *Be* of the same mind one toward another.
Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate [*or*, lowly things].[5]
17 Be not wise in your own conceits. Recompense to no man evil for evil. Pro-
vide [Have a care for] things honest [honorable] in the sight of all men.[6]
18 If it be possible, as much as lieth in [dependeth on] you, live peaceably [be at
19 peace] with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves [Avenge not your-
selves, dearly beloved], but *rather* give place unto wrath [to the wrath,
sc., of God]: for it is written,[7] Vengeance *is* mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.
20 Therefore

If thine enemy hunger, feed him;
If he thirst, give him drink:
For in [by] so doing
Thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.

21 Be not overcome of [by] evil, but overcome evil with good.

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 9.—[The imperatives of the E. V. are retained, since we accept the hortatory view of the participles. It is true, the E. V. itself occasionally retains the participial form (vers. 10, 11, 12, 13), but only in such a way as not to disturb the hortatory meaning. See the *Exeg. Notes* on the construction.

[2] Ver. 10.—[The E. V. has inverted the Greek order in these brief clauses. The datives stand first, and their equivalents should occupy the same position in English So Five Ang. Clergymen, Amer. Bible Union, &c.

[3] Ver. 11.—[The *Rec.*, with ℵ. A. B. D[2] [3]. L., most fathers, reads: κυρίῳ; adopted by Beza, Lachmann, Scholz, Tischendorf, De Wette, Philippi, Alford, Tregelles. Dr. Lange, however, follows Griesbach, Mill, Fritzsche, and Meyer, who adopt καιρῷ, on the authority of D[1]. F. G., Latin fathers (so Luther). Yet Meyer himself acknowledges that the other reading is better supported; he rejects it on account of the critical difficulty of accounting for the variation, were κυρίῳ genuine, especially as the phrase: serve the Lord, is so common with Paul. Dr. Lange says: "Such a general summons to serve the Lord, looks like an interruption in the midst of general directions. The reading, as Meyer observes, is readily explained by the fact that a prejudiced moral feeling would easily stumble at the principle: τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύειν." It would seem that Dr. Lange is governed rather by a desire to preserve certain exegetical correspondences, than by the results of critical investigation. See Alford in favor of the received reading. He contends that, besides the weight of external authorities, the internal probabilities sustain it. "The *present* subject is, the *character of our zeal for God.*" "The command, τῷ καιρῷ δουλ., would surely come in very inopportunely in the midst of exhortations to the *zealous service of God.*" De Wette, indeed, doubts the propriety of the expression, remarking that Christians may *employ τὸν καιρόν*, but not serve it. On the whole, I feel constrained to differ from Dr. Lange, and to retain the reading of the *Rec.* See further in the *Exeg. Notes.*

[4] Ver. 13.—[*Rec.*, ℵ. A. B. D[3].: χρείαις; D[1]. F.: μνείαις. The former is adopted by all modern editors. The latter was "a corruption introduced, hardly accidentally, in favor of the *honor of martyrs by commemoration*" (Alford). So Meyer, and most. Dr. Lange admits that the reading μνείαις, which he rejects here, is supported by the same authorities as the reading καιρῷ (ver. 11), which he accepts. "But the connection here pronounces in favor of the *Recepta.*" He intimates that he finds another meaning than "the worship of martyrs" in the rejected reading, but does not state what it is.

[5] Ver. 16.—[See *Exeg. Notes.*

[6] Ver. 17.—[After καλά, A[2]., Polycarp, &c., insert ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ; F. G., Vulgate, Gothic, many fathers, insert οὐ μόνον ἐνώπιον τ. θεοῦ ἀλλὰ καί. These additions are rejected by all modern editors, as taken from Prov. iii. 4, where the LXX. reads: προνοοῦ καλὰ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων.—Instead of πάντων (*Rec.*, ℵ. B. D[3]. L., versions and fathers), A[2]. D[1]. F. &c., have τῶν, which probably arose from the previous insertion.

[7] Ver. 19.—[From Deut. xxxii. 35, where the LXX. reads: ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω. Heb.: לִי נָקָם וְשִׁלֵּם, "mine is revenge and requital." The same thought is found, Jer. xxviii. 6. Heb. x. 30 quotes precisely as here.

[8] Ver. 20.—[An exact quotation from the LXX., Prov. xxv. 21, 2?. There is, however, a variation in the opening words. The *Rec.*, with D[3] L., some versions and fathers, reads: ἐὰν οὖν (ἐάν alone is from the LXX.); adopted by De Wette, Philippi, Wordsworth, and Lange (Hodge and Stuart accept it without remark). D[1]. F., and other authorities, have ἐάν alone; so Tischendorf. ℵ. A. B.: ἀλλὰ ἐάν (Lachmann. Meyer, Alford). Other variations occur in the fathers It is difficult to decide. Probably οὖν was the original reading, then rejected because the inference was not understood, or to conform to the LXX.; then ἀλλὰ substituted, as a connecting particle was deemed necessary. Certainly ἐὰν οὖν is *lectio difficilior*. Even Alford seems inclined to adopt it.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary.—The remark, that the expression ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος serves as an inscription to all the following participles, has induced us, after the example of Meyer, and others, to begin the new section with ver. 9.* It may be doubted whether the Apostle has mentally supplied ἔστω or ἐστί. The latter view is favored by the idea of Christian love, not merely "toward others," but in a universal relation; see ver. 11. The first construction is favored by the hortatory form appearing more strongly toward the end. Our earlier division was based on the fact that vers. 9 and 10 treat of conduct toward companions in faith within the Church. The Apostle, however, makes use of a long series of participles, as if he would urge not so much a Christian course of conduct, as to set up a typical rule of conduct for believers, according to unfeigned love.

[De Wette, Olshausen, and others, supply ἐστι, thus making these verses descriptive, not hortatory. They urge that the use of the participle for the imperative is very rare. That is true; but in ver. 14 we have the imperative, followed by an infinitive in ver. 15, and then by participles, vers. 16–19; all of these latter clauses being of a hortatory character. With most commentators (so E. V.), we prefer to supply ἔστω with the first clause of ver. 9, and ἐστί with the following participles, since ver. 8 is of a hortatory character. Meyer, Philippi, Tischendorf, Lachmann, larger edition, declare for this; the editors by their punctuation, which is the same in the main as that of the E. V. Lachmann also favors (smaller edition) joining the participles with the imperative in ver. 14, and thus obtaining the hortatory force; this, however, is not only singular, but contrary to the thought, which will not permit these participles to modify the imperative, *bless*. Fritzsche takes the participles as corresponding to the personal subjects of "love unfeigned," as 2 Cor. i. 7; but this is unnecessary.—R.]

Ver. 9. **Let your love be unfeigned**] ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος. We are justified in strengthening ἡ ἀγάπη into *your love*, in English. But the Apostle means *love* absolutely, not merely love to the brethren (which is spoken of afterwards), nor love to God. The adjective need not be paraphrased, as in E. V.—R.] See 2 Cor. vi. 6; 1 Peter i. 22. Meyer well says: "As love, so also must faith, its root, be;" 1 Tim. i. 5; 2 Tim. i. 8. Undissembled love is therefore the inscription for the whole series of prescriptions which the Apostle lays down in parallelisms of two and of three members.

Abhor that which is evil. ἀποστυγοῦντες. Strictly, repelling with repugnance. This first grand antithesis says, that believers should turn away with utter abhorrence from that which is evil, in order to cleave to the good with inseparable attachment, as with bridal affection. This antithesis constitutes the practice of heaven and heavenly life, and its realization is the life of our Lord. Its breaking off and turning away, as well as its connecting and uniting, constitute the fundamental moral law of God's kingdom. The second antithesis unites with this.

* [In the first edition, vers. 9 and 10 were added to the previous section. The present division has the support of the best modern commentators, and must be deemed a happy alteration.—R.]

Ver. 10. **In brotherly love.** φιλαδελφίᾳ [The dative is that of *reference:* as respects brotherly love.—R.] Specific brotherly love for fellow Christians; 1 Thess. iv. 9; Heb. xiii. 1; 1 Peter i. 22; 2 Peter i. 7.—[**Be affectionate one to another,** εἰς ἀλλήλους] φιλόστοργοι. Be lovers as toward those related in blood.

In honour. Τιμῇ, esteem. The antithesis here is the *equalization* in confiding brotherly love, and the subordination of our own personality to our esteem for others.

Preferring one another. Προηγούμενοι. The explanations: excelling (Chrysostom, and others), obliging (Theophylact, Luther, and others), and esteeming higher (Theodoret, Grotius; see Tholuck), are intimately connected therewith. [Stuart: "In giving honor, anticipating one another." Meyer: "*Going before* as *guides;* i. e., with conduct inciting others to follow." These explanations, however, do not seem to suit τιμῇ; hence Alford, and most, prefer the meaning given in the Vulgate: *invicem prævenientes*. Hodge: "Instead of waiting for others to honor us, we should be beforehand with them in the manifestation of respect."—R.]

Ver. 11. **In diligence, not slothful,** &c. [τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί, κ.τ.λ.] This clause, which has three members, defines proper activity in reference to temporal affairs, just as the following clause, which also has three members, defines proper passivity in these affairs. Both verses define the personal conduct of the Christian in relation to himself, according to his situation in time.* The principal rule of the first clause is: not to shrink halfheartedly from the whole work of time, but to work with persevering enthusiasm. To this belongs the polar conduct of remaining warm in spirit (seething and boiling like a hot spring), and overcoming the time (see Acts xviii. 25), while in one's daily task adapting one's self to the moment, to the will of the κύριος in the καιρός, so that He is served by observing its full meaning. Δουλ. τῷ καιρῷ, *tempori servire* (Cicero), and similar expressions; see Meyer, p. 463. The expression was usual in the bad sense (of unprincipled accommodation), as in the good (to accommodate one's self to the time). But here it reads: controlling the time by serving the Lord; Eph. v. 16; see Tholuck, pp. 669 ff., who gives the preference to the reading κυρίῳ.

[**Serving the Lord,** τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες. On the readings, see *Textual Note* [8]. The adoption of the reading καιρῷ, which is not so well sustained as that of the *Rec.*, has influenced the exegesis of Dr. Lange throughout the verse. Philippi urges against καιρῷ its equivocal meaning, and the fact that Paul always represents the Christian as *free*, a servant only to *God*, or *Christ*, or *righteousness*—never of the *time*. In fact, the injunction seems scarcely to differ from one of worldly wisdom, if that reading be accepted. Eph. v. 16; Col. iv. 5, will not justify the expression. Fritzsche *in loco* admits an interchange of κύριος and καιρός in other places.—Dr. Hodge explains: "Influenced in our activity and zeal by a desire to serve Christ. This

* [The reading adopted by Dr. Lange in the last clause leads him to this limitation of meaning. While, as Philippi observes, there is no necessity for limiting the diligence to evangelistic efforts, it seems equally uncalled for to refer it exclusively to temporal affairs, as is done by Dr. Lange and the E. V. ("business"). Luther is not literally exact, but gives the correct sense: *Seid nicht träge, was ihr thun sollt;* Be not slothful in what you ought to do. Thus it is referred to all Christian duty as such (Alford).—R.]

member of the sentence, thus understood, describes the motive from which zeal and diligence should proceed." The common interpretation, derived from the E. V., is: not slothful in temporal affairs, yet of an earnest religious spirit, because all is done in the service of the Lord. If the first clause be extended so as to include "whatever our hand finds to do," this is sufficiently correct. The second member derives its appropriateness from the fact—never more noticeable than in these bustling days, when even religious duty partakes somewhat of the spirit of the age—that zeal and diligence may become a habit and passion, a mere activity, lacking the genuine fervor of the *spirit*. The last term does not, indeed, refer to the Holy Spirit, but, in an exhortation to Christians, may well be taken as meaning the human spirit under the influence of the Holy Spirit.—R.] This is followed by a trichotomy as the proper passivity in temporal relations.

Ver. 12. **In hope, rejoicing** [*τῇ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες*. Stuart thinks the datives in this verse also are datives of reference: as respects hope, rejoicing, &c. But the regularity has been broken in upon by the *τῷ κυρίῳ* of the preceding verse; we are therefore warranted in adopting a different view here, especially as the datives in this verse seem not to be parallel to each other. The verb *χαίρειν* may indeed govern the dative, but the *hope* is rather the *ground* than the object of rejoicing (so Meyer, Alford). De Wette, Philippi: *vermöge der Hoffnung;* Hodge: *on account of hope.* The hope is objective, and to be taken more generally than Dr. Lange suggests. His view results from reading *καιρῷ* above.—R.] The antithesis shows that here the *ἐλπίς*, as formerly the *σπουδή*, must be regarded as prevalently objective. In the time bestowing hope. It is in harmony with the childlike character of faith to rejoice gratefully over every good token; but it is also in harmony with manliness to be patient in tribulation.

In tribulation, patient; in prayer, persevering [*τῇ θλίψει ὑπομένοντες· τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες*. Alford: *τῇ θλίψει*, the state in which the *ὑπομονή* is found. Philippi, De Wette, Meyer, &c., think *ἐν* was omitted on account of the parallelism of construction, though the verb governs the dative (more usually the accusative, however). On the second clause, comp. Col. iv. 2; Acts i. 14.—R.] The harmonization of the great contrasts of life lies in the persevering life of prayer. Similar harmonizations, see James i. 9, 10: chap. v. 13. Bengel: *Gaudium non modo est affectus, sed etiam officium christianorum.* Tholuck and Meyer would regard the hope here quite universally, as the foundation of Christian joy. This is not favored by the antithesis *τῇ θλίψει*. Meyer here reads the dative: standing out against tribulation. But Paul will not consider tribulation as an adversary. We also prefer *being patient* to *being steadfast*, as continued steadfastness is placed here finally in the life of prayer.*

Ver. 13. **Communicating to the necessities of saints** [*ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες*. See *Textual Note* [4].—R.] The believer naturally comes from his own necessity to the necessity of his brethren. *Ταῖς χρείαις.* The meaning of the verb *κοιν.*: *distributing to*, is opposed by Meyer and Tholuck. It is sufficient here that *holding fellowship with* is the fuller and stronger expression, yet not fellowship "in the necessities" of fellow-Christians, but with them; or, in other words: to participate in their necessities (Chrysostom, Theodoret).*—**Given to hospitality** [*τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες*, literally, *pursuing hospitality*.—R.] In ancient times, hospitality was also a highly important work of love, for the relief of necessity; Heb. xiii. 2; 1 Peter iv. 9.

Ver. 14. **Bless those who persecute you,** &c. [*εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας ὑμᾶς, κ.τ.λ.*] Here the hortatory form becomes distinct; see Matt. v. 44. Probably the expression of Jesus has reached Paul by the tradition of the Church. Tholuck: "It is just from the Sermon on the Mount that we find the most reminiscences; 1 Cor. vii. 10; James iv. 9; v. 12; 1 Peter iii. 9; iv. 14." Tholuck, very strangely, supposes here a so-called lexical connection—*i. e.*, that ver. 14 is accidentally called forth by the word *διώκοντες*.† But it is incorrect to suppose that the exhortation of ver. 14 interrupts such exhortations as vers. 13 and 15, which relate to the mutual conduct of Christians; ver. 15 has been too generally regarded as favoring this view.

Ver. 15. **Rejoice with those who rejoice,** &c. [*χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων, κ.τ.λ.* On the infinitive as imperative, see Winer, p. 296. Meyer fills out the sentence thus: *χαίρειν ὑμᾶς δεῖ*.—R.] *Χαίρειν*, the infinitive as an imperative, to be supplemented mentally by a corresponding verb; see Sirach vii. 33, 34. Ver. 14 defines the proper conduct in relation to personal *antipathy;* ver. 15, the proper conduct in relation to personal *sympathy*.

Ver. 16. **Be of the same mind one toward another** [*τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες*]. The participles in ver. 16 have been variously construed; now with the preceding imperative *χαίρειν, κλαίειν*, ver. 16, and now with the following *μὴ γίνεσθε*; see Philippi. Because of the great difficulties of such connections, commentators prefer to supply *ἔστε* (Philippi, Meyer).‡

* [The idea of *ὑπομένειν* is patient continuance, or steadfastness, although, at times, the idea of patience may be the prominent one. It may be doubted whether the other thought is not equally prominent here. So Philippi; *in der Drangsal beständig.*—Accepting the wider reference of the verse, Dr. Hodge says: "This hope of salvation is the most effectual means of producing patience under present afflictions." "Intercourse with God, however, is necessary to the exercise of this, and all other virtues, and therefore the Apostle immediately adds: *continuing instant in prayer*." He finds in this expression two attributes of acceptable prayer—perseverance and favor—both implying faith in God.—R.]

* [Meyer paraphrases: "having fellowship in the necessities of the saints; *i. e.*, conducting yourselves as though the necessities of your fellow-Christians were your own, and thus seeking to meet them." Stuart: "in respect to the wants of the saints, be sympathetic;" but the dative is hardly a dative of reference. The intransitive meaning of the verb must be insisted upon (Tholuck, Meyer, and most). Even in Gal. vi. 6, the transitive meaning must be given up. (Comp. Lange's *Comm. in loco*, p. 150.)—R.]

† [Wordsworth finds a happy play upon the words, *διώκοντες* (ver. 13), *διώκοντας* (ver. 14). "It would seem as if the Apostle's mind, strained by the pressure of the argument with which it had been laboring, now gracefully and playfully relaxes itself in Christian cheerfulness. In his conciliatory courtesy, he would show his readers what he had said severely concerning them in the former parts of his Epistle, had been spoken in love. So he now says, in a tone of lively affection: Even we Christians, whom the world *persecutes*, ought to be *persecutors;* we ought to follow with our blessings and our prayers those who pursue us with rancor and disdain."—On the spirit of this injunction, see Hodge *in loco*, especially the extract from Calvin which he gives.—R.]

‡ [We retain the imperative form of the E. V. It might

The attempt at the proper construction would be best favored by returning to ver. 15, and reading this injunction as a fundamental thought, controlling what follows, clothed in figurative expression and made explicit by the beginning of ver. 16. On this wise:

First trichotomy: Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep: *being of the same mind one toward another.*

Second trichotomy: Mind not high things, but condescend to the lowly. Addition: Be not wise in your own conceits (in seclusion).

Third trichotomy: Recompense to no man evil for evil; provide things honest in the sight of all men; if it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.

Fourth trichotomy: Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written, &c. All this follows from the conduct of Christians toward each other. But then the whole glory of this reciprocal feeling is elaborated in the Christian love of enemies, which conquers evil by good; vers. 20, 21.

The same. Τὸ αὐτό; see chap. xv. 5; Phil. ii. 2; iv. 2; 2 Cor. xiii. 7. They should adhere to the same, what is equal, what is common, in their intercourse with each other, or in the intercourse of one toward others; reminder of the Golden Rule. According to Phil. ii. 4, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν proceeds from the τὸ ἓν φρονεῖν. Adherence to one results in adhering to the same; then, this results in unity, which, however, is only a special fruit of that general conduct. Likewise Tholuck. [Dr. Hodge thinks *concord of feeling* is the prominent thought.] Chrysostom's view is different: not to regard one's self better than others, and similarly.

Mind not high things [μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες]. Not merely "high-aspiring selfishness," but also self-complacent fancies; for example, Novatian, puritanic, aristocratic, or humanistic fancies injure, or even tear asunder, the bond of communion, of Christian fellowship with the Church, and of humane fellowship with the world.

But condescend to men of low estate. Τοῖς ταπεινοῖς. Construed as masculine by Chrysostom, Erasmus, Luther [Alford, Wordsworth], and others. (Various definitions: Christians should count themselves among the lowly; should suffer with the oppressed; should remain in fellowship with the lowly, with publicans and sinners.) But Fritzsche, Reiche, De Wette [Stuart], and many others, have declared in favor of the neuter. Meyer: Subjecting yourselves to the lower situations and occupations of life. The antithesis τὰ ὑψηλά is urged. But the antithesis is modified by the change of the verb into συναπαγόμενοι. The latter verb denotes, *to be carried off, to be taken along with,* or, *to allow one's self to be carried off, to be misled, to be taken along with* (see Tholuck, p. 673). This may apply as a duty toward the brethren in low estate, who, in opposition to high things, represent the real essence of humanity in the form of a servant; but it cannot apply to trivial and low things. We should take small things into consideration in the light of duties, but not to permit ourselves to be carried off by them. But of small men, who are great in God's eyes, it is said with propriety: that we should devote ourselves to them through suffering to glory. Imprisoned and hung with the lowly, but not with the bad!

The neuter construction is thus explained by Calvin, and others: *humilibus rebus obsecundantes* (about: to be true in small things); while Grotius, and others, thus explain the masculine construction: *modestissimorum exempla sectantes.*

[On the whole, the masculine is preferable; fo in no other case in the New Testament is the adjective ταπεινός used of things. Nor does the Apostle's antithesis require the neuter meaning. Alford: "In τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες, the ὑψηλά are necessarily *subjective*—the *lofty thoughts of the man.* But in τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπ. the adjective is necessarily *objective*—some outward objects, with which the persons exhorted are συναπάγεσθαι. And those outward objects are defined, if I mistake not, by the εἰς ἀλλήλους." Dr. Hodge, and many others, do not decide between the two views.—R.]

Be not wise, &c. Μὴ γίνεσθε, κ.τ.λ. See chap. xi. 25. But there the conceit of one's own wisdom constitutes an antithesis to God's revelation, while here it constitutes an antithesis to the fellowship of men (not merely of Christians in a good sense).

Ver. 17. **Recompense to no man evil for evil** [μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδιδόντες. Alford: "The Apostle now proceeds to exhort respecting conduct *to those without.*" There is, however, no warrant for this limitation in the language, and certainly the temptation to render evil for evil to *Christians* is frequent enough.—R.] Meyer: "The principle itself, and how it stood opposed to heathendom and pharisaism!"

[**Have a care for things honourable,** προνοούμενοι καλά. Lange: *Seid auf das Edle bedacht. Have careful regard to what is noble,* &c. Dr. Hodge finds here a motive for the injunction which precedes, and objects to the period after "evil" in the E. V., as well as to the translation "honest," which undoubtedly conveys to the ordinary reader the thought that we are bidden to provide for ourselves and families in an honest way The clause much resembles Prov. iii. 4 (LXX.) hence the variations.—R.]

In the sight of all men [ἐνώπιον πάντων ἀνθρώπων. See *Textual Note* [6].] Meyer: Before the eyes of all men. We regard the term as an expression of the relation to the most diverse men. However, the other construction also makes good sense; for Christians could often expose individuals to danger, by giving them cause for offence; Prov. iii. 4; 2 Cor. viii. 21.

Ver. 18. **If it be possible,** &c. Εἰ δυνατόν is referred by Erasmus, Bengel, and others, to what precedes [but this is objectionable]. The clause: *as much as dependeth on you,* explains the εἰ δυνατόν. It may be outwardly impossible to us to live at peace with every body; but inwardly we should be peaceably disposed, prepared for peace, toward every body. [The εἰ δυνατόν is *objective* (Tholuck, De Wette, Meyer, Alford), not, "if *you can,*" but, if it be possible, if others will allow it "All YOUR *part is to be peace:* whether you actually live peaceably or not, will depend, then, solely on how *others* behave toward *you*" (Alford). That this is often impossible, the Apostle's life plainly shows.—R.]

Ver. 19. **Avenge not yourselves, dearly beloved.** The additional ἀγαπητοί, loving pressure. [The address becomes more affectionate

perhaps be changed to the participial, as is done in the revision by Five Ang. Clergymen; but this would render a change in punctuation necessary.—R.]

as the duty becomes more difficult (so Tholuck).—R.]

Give place unto the wrath [δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ]. Make way for Divine wrath; do not anticipate it; do not get in its way; let it rule. This is the explanation of most commentators, from Chrysostom and Augustine down to Tholuck, De Wette, Meyer, and Philippi. [So Hodge.]—Second explanation: Let not your own wrath break forth (Du Dieu, Semler [Stuart], and others). Meyer, on the contrary: The *Latin* usage of *non iræ spatium dare* harmonizes very well with this, but the Greek usage of τόπον διδόναι does not. [Jowett says this explanation "is equally indefensible on grounds of language and sense. It is only as a translation of a Latinism we can suppose the phrase to have any meaning at all; and the meaning thus obtained, 'defer your wrath,' is out of place." See his remarks in defence of the next explanation.—R.]—Third explanation: *To give place to the wrath of your enemy* (Schöttgen, Morus, and others). Meyer: This would be only a prudential measure.* The first explanation is raised above all doubt by the addition: *Vengeance is mine.*†

For it is written, Deut. xxxii. 35.—Addition: λέγει κύριος; see Heb. x. 30.

Ver. 20. **Therefore if thine enemy,** &c. [ἐὰν οὖν πεινᾷ, κ.τ.λ. See *Textual Note* [8].] The οὖν, which is omitted by most Codd., probably on account of difficulty, follows from the antithesis. One cannot conform to the negative: not to hate an enemy, without obeying the affirmative. [Hodge: "The expressions are obviously not to be confined to their literal meaning, nor even to the discharge of the common offices of humanity; they are figurative expressions for all the duties of benevolence. It is not enough, therefore, that we preserve an enemy from perishing; we must treat him with all affection and kindness."—R.] The words are from the LXX. of Prov. xxv. 21.

Thou shalt heap coals of fire, &c. [ἄνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις, κ.τ.λ.] The burning of fiery coals is an Oriental figure of constantly burning pain. Explanations:

1. Thou wilt draw down upon him severe Divine wrath (with reference to 4 Ezra xvi. 54: Chrysostom, Theodoret, &c., Zwingli, Beza, &c., Stolz, Hengstenberg, &c.).

2. Thou wilt prepare him for the pain of penitence (Augustine, Jerome [Tholuck, De Wette, Meyer], Luther, and many others). Origen has opposed the former view, which was continually under the necessity of being established in the Church, because of the propensity to wrath. On Hengstenberg's explanation of Prov. xxiv. 18, see Tholuck, p. 675 ff. Ver. 21, as well as the spirit of the passage, pronounces in favor of explanation (2.). No one could gladly requite evil with good, if he knew of a certainty that he would thereby be exposed to Divine wrath. Finally, this explanation is favored by the whole spirit of Christianity. Yet it must be observed, that penitence cannot be designated as an infallible effect of the love of enemies, and of its expressions. The most immediate effect of such expressions is *burning shame*, a religious and moral crisis. He will bend his head as if fiery coals lay on it. The rule, as well as the purpose, of this crisis, is penitence and conversion; but there are frequent instances of false adversaries, like Judas, becoming hardened by kindness.

[3. Slightly different from (2.) is that adopted by Hodge: "You will take the most effectual means of subduing him." Kindness is as effectual as coals of fire. So Alford: "You will be taking the most effectual vengeance." Similarly Jowett. This view, which excludes even the pain of penitence, is favored by the connection with ver. 21.—R.] For other unimportant explanations, see the Note in Meyer, p. 468.* On the figure of fiery coals, see Tholuck, p. 675.

Ver. 21. [**Be not overcome,** &c. μὴ νικῶ, κ.τ.λ. "A comprehensive summary of vers. 19, 20. *Be not overcome* (led to revenge) *by evil* (which is done to you), *but overcome by the good* (which you show to your enemy) *evil* (by causing your enemy, ashamed by your noble spirit, to cease doing evil to you, and to become your friend);" Meyer. Seneca, *De Benef.*, 7, 31: *Vincit malos pertinax bonitas.*—R.] The purpose of all these manifestations of love is that of Christ on the cross: to *overcome evil with good.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The proper conduct in personal intercourse, particularly with the brethren, is love without *dissimulation;* as the proper conduct toward the Church, previously described, is love without *self-boasting.* The conduct toward civil authorities (which follows in chap. xiii.) is love *without fear;* and, finally, the proper conduct toward the world is love *without despising the rights of the world, and without mingling with the immorality of the world.*

2. The root of brotherly love is reverence for the appearing image of Christ; and its development and consummation are types of the most inward consanguinity.

3. The proper conduct toward different individuals begins with proper conduct toward ourselves; portrayed in ver. 11. To this there belongs, first of all, fresh spiritual life; zealous and enthusiastic work, embracing eternity as the blessing of the

* [Dr. Lange quotes Meyer's objection to one single phase of this explanation, and that not the one most prominently urged. Ewald, Jowett, Wordsworth, understand by this view, which they defend, not *getting out of* the way of the wrath of another, but, allowing it to spend itself upon you, "let your enemy have his way." So far from deeming this a prudential step, Jowett defends it from the objection, that "common prudence requires that we should defend ourselves against our enemies," by urging that the gospel does not always give "counsels of prudence, but of perfection" Meyer, however, opposes the real explanation of these authors, by saying that such a meaning has too little positive moral character; and further, that the prohibition of revenge by no means implies that the personal object is an angry one. These objections are valid ones.—R.]

† [The first explanation is the most natural one; but Alford suggests another, viz.: "*Anger*, generally; 'proceed not to execute it hastily, but leave it for its legitimate time, when He whose it is to avenge will execute it: make not the wrath your own, but leave it for God.'" Wordsworth, in defending the third explanation, objects to the first: "It could hardly be presented as a Christian duty—to make room for the Divine wrath to work against an enemy." He furthermore defends the ambiguous rendering of the E. V., as excellent from its ambiguity, from not saying too much, and thus inviting study, using this opportunity for opposing a revision. "I ever held it a kind of honest spiritual thrift, when there are *two senses* given of one place, both agreeable to the analogy of faith and manners, *to make use of both*" (Bishop Sanderson). Dr. Wordsworth approves this rule for expositors. His own practice of this "spiritual thrift" may lead to spiritual wealth, but certainly seems to tend to *exegetical poverty.*—R.]

* [Among these, the reference to the *softening* by burning coals (Glöckler), the *inflaming* to love (Calovius), the *red* blush of shame live-glowing coals (Sanctius).—R.]

Spirit; calm ardor in communion with God, and in the consciousness of its being sent by God; but regarding the moment of time as the moment of eternity in time. In this place belongs Solomon's Ecclesiastes, this much-mistaken pearl of the Old Testament—a writing whose fundamental thought is, that every thing is regarded vain in consequence of despising eternity in time.

4. The Apostle's pen gives a festive expression even to Christian ethics; as is proved by the beautiful parallelisms, mostly in the form of trilogies, in this chapter, together with 1 Cor. xiii. [Comp. Erasmus on this chapter: "*Comparibus membris et incisis, similiter cadentibus ac desinentibus sic totus sermo modulatus est, ut nulla cautio possit esse jucundior.*"—R.] Christian life should also be a worship. But the worship is festive, free from common weariness.

5. All Christianity is a conquest of evil by good, which Christ has established, and already decided in principle, on His cross. All the single rules of conduct toward individuals concentrate in this last and highest one.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 9-21. The sincerity of love. It is manifested in: 1. Our abhorring that which is evil; and, 2. In cleaving to that which is good (ver. 9)—Let not love be false. 1. What is it to love in this way? 2. How is it possible? (ver. 9.)—What belongs to true brotherly love? 1. Sincere heartiness; 2. Obliging respect (ver. 10).—Universal love and brotherly love. 1. How far related? 2. How far different? Comp. 2 Peter i. 7 (vers. 9, 10).—Christian joy in labor. 1. Its nature; 2. Its origin; 3. Its limit (ver. 11).—Be not indolent in doing what you should! (ver. 11).—Be fervent in spirit! A pentecostal sentiment (ver. 11).—Adapt yourselves to the time! A word of comfort in times of need and tribulation (ver. 11).—Rejoice in hope, be patient in tribulation, continue instant in prayer—an inexhaustible text, and one that can be always applied afresh on marriage occasions, in harvest sermons in years of failure, or in New Years' sermons in troublous times (ver. 12).—Distribute to the necessity of saints! 1. Description of it (with special references similar to those in ver. 11). 2. A summons to energetic assistance (ver. 13).—The forgiving Christian spirit. 1. A beautiful virtue; but, 2. One very difficult to exercise; and therefore, 3. Proper to be implored from God (ver. 14).—Christian sympathy: 1. In joy; 2. In sorrow (ver. 15).—Christian unanimity (ver. 16).—Christian humility (ver. 16).—Christian honesty (ver. 17).—Christian peacefulness (ver. 18).—Christian love of enemies. 1. It desists from revenge; 2. It overcomes evil with good (vers. 19-21).—Fiery coals on the head of an enemy: 1. They cause pain; but, 2. Healing pain, because it is the pain of shame vers. 19-21).

LUTHER: To heap coals of fire on the head is, that, by kindness, our enemy grows angry with himself for having acted so wickedly toward us.

STARKE: True Christianity does not make lazy people and sluggards, but industrious ones; for the more pious the Christian is, the more industrious laborer he is (ver. 11).—Dear Christian, you present a gift to strange beggars, though you do not know whether they are holy or not—indeed, the most are without holiness; should you not rather do good to the poor who live among us, who prove by their deeds that they are holy and God's children? (ver. 13.)—He who rises high, falls all the lower; such conduct is always dangerous. High trees are shaken most violently by the winds; high towers are most frequently struck by the thunder-storm; what is high is easily moved, and likely to fall. Rather remain low, and then you will not fall, Sirach iii. 19 (ver. 16).—If you have wisdom, it is not your own, but God's; let it not be observed that you know your wisdom. There are others also who are not fools; and there are many superior to you (ver. 16). —Every one should be ruler of his own spirit, Prov. xvi. 32 (ver. 21).—It is most glorious to show good for evil, and to make a friend out of an enemy, Prov. xvi. 6 (ver. 21).—As fire is not quenched by fire, so is evil not quenched by evil, nor invective by invective.—HEDINGER: Christianity is not absurd selfishness and incivility. Love and patience teach quite different things toward our neighbor (ver. 10). —MÜLLER: The richer and higher in God, the poorer and more like nothing in our own eyes, 2 Sam. vii. 18 (ver. 10).—God sends His cross to us that it may press from our hearts many fervent sighs, from our mouth many a glorious little prayer, and from our eyes many hot tears (ver. 12).—Christian souls are *one* soul in Christ, and therefore one feels the sorrow and joy of another (ver. 15).—To do good is natural; to do evil is carnal; to do evil for good is devilish; to do good for evil is divine (ver. 17).

SPENER: Love is the principal virtue required by Christ of His disciples (ver. 9).—*Brotherly* love should be as hearty as natural love between parents, children, and brethren (the στοργή), and should not be lukewarm, but zealous (ver. 10).—The Spirit of God is a holy fire, which inflames hearts wherever it is. Where things go very sleepily, we may well apprehend that, because there is no fire, there is no zeal, and that there is also no work of the Spirit, but only of nature. Yet there should be a fervency and zeal of the *spirit*. For the flesh has also its blind zeal, which is the more dangerous the greater it is (ver. 11).—*Accommodate yourselves to the time.* But this must not be in such a way as to join in with the world, as every period brings with it that which the Apostle (ver. 2) has already forbidden—conformity to this world. But Christians should not lose the opportunity of doing good which God constantly presents to them; and they should always give due care to all circumstances—to what is best now to be done according to the Divine rule. Moreover, they should always give due attention to the condition in which they are situated, so that they may act just as God now requires of them (ver. 11). —In prosperity and adversity, prayer is the best means for our support (ver. 12).

ROOS: Christians should be refined and polite people (ver. 17).

GERLACH: The most glowing love should not lose sobriety and discretion, by virtue of which it chooses and performs just what the circumstances require; comp. Matt. x. 16 (ver. 11).—"'It is well,' says one, 'that he has very properly commanded weeping with those who weep; but for what end did he command us to do the other part, that which is not great?' And yet, rejoicing with them that rejoice is a far more self-denying state of mind than weeping with those who weep;" Chrysostom (ver. 15).—By *fiery coals* we must understand that we

lead the one who injures us to repentance of his deed, by doing good to him (ver. 20).

LISCO: How the love of the believer, arising from humility, is manifested toward other believers. 1. Its peculiarity (vers. 9-12); 2. Its manifestations amid very different external circumstances (vers. 13-16).—Relation of the believer to the unbelieving world. He is even animated with love toward it (vers. 17-21).

HEUBNER: Love should be tender and delicate; it should avoid every thing that can offend another's sense of modesty or honor. Indelicacy is always a want of respect (ver. 10).—Christianity teaches the real art of being always happy.—The Christian must keep in a good humor. Hope is the *source* of the Christian's cheerfulness; the *condition* of it is patience. *Prayer* strengthens both faith and hope (ver. 12).

BESSER: The works of Christians in love (vers. 9-21).—Paul calls upon us to oppose two special enemies of unity: 1. Pride; 2. Self-conceits of wisdom (ver. 16).—Saul felt most painfully the burning coals from David's hand, 1 Sam. xxiv. 17 ff.

SCHLEIERMACHER: The Apostle's injunction: Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep. 1. What is the scope of it—what are the limits which he has assigned to it? 2. Its connection with our spiritual life in God's kingdom (ver. 15).—Perseverance against the evil sorely afflicting us. It consists in: 1. Our taking care lest evil prostrate our spirit; 2. In being careful not to lose our sobriety, when engaged in work, by surprise; 3. And in being on our guard lest our pleasure in life be destroyed by the pressure of evil (ver. 21).

Vers. 7-16. THE PERICOPE *for the Second Sunday after Epiphany.*—HEUBNER: The fruits of Christian faith in human life.—The connection of the Christian virtues.—The real life as a practical school of Christianity.—HARLESS: *True fidelity to calling.* 1. Good Christian deportment is always likewise fidelity to calling; 2. The discharge of one's calling is true when it is done with simplicity, with care, and with pleasure; 3. This fidelity to calling arises alone from true love; 4. But true love arises alone from the humility of Christian faith.—JASPIS: True Christians are also the most faithful laborers. 1. They regard their lifetime as a very gracious gift; 2. They act continually from holy motives; 3. They feel inwardly united with their fellow-men; 4. They have too serious a reverence for their Eternal Judge to discharge their calling unconscientiously.—KREHL: Strengthening of patience in tribulation by: 1. Wise hope; 2. Pious reflection; 3. Steadfast prayer; 4. Joyous hope.

Vers. 17-21. THE PERICOPE *for the Third Sunday after Epiphany.*—HEUBNER: The Christian amid the afflicting relations of the world. 1. He uses them for opposing his own self-love; 2. He uses them for greater severity toward himself; 3. For the practice of a peaceful disposition; 4. For the exhibition of love toward enemies; 5. For increasing his stability and steadfastness.—The dignity of Christian peacefulness: 1. Its source; 2. Its limits; 3. Its strength.—BECK: Direction for the art of genuine Christian peacefulness. 1. Stop up the fountain of disquietude in your own heart; 2. Give place to the external occasion to disquietude by conscientious and blameless deportment toward every body; 3. Amid external temptations, direct your heart to the highest Requiter; 4. Strive to overcome the hatred of enemies by good deeds, and to turn away the punishment impending over them. —F. A. WOLF: Avenge not yourselves! 1. The meaning of this declaration of the Apostle; 2. How it should be observed.

KAPFF: What belongs to true culture: 1. Modesty and humility; 2. Universal philanthropy; 3 Truth and purity of heart.—BRANDT: Christianity is the way to a peaceful and blessed life; for it: 1. Opposes our own conceits; 2. Forbids all revenge; 3. Recommends honesty; 4. Loves peacefulness; 5. Enjoins magnanimity; 6. And always desires the conquest of all evil.

[HOPKINS: *On revenge* (ver. 15). Revenge is a wild, untamed passion, that knows no bounds nor measures. And if we were permitted to carve it out for ourselves, we should certainly exceed all limits and moderation; for self-love, which is an immoderate affection, would be made the whole rule of our vengeance: and because we love ourselves abundantly too well, we should revenge every imaginary wrong done us with too much bitterness and severity: and, therefore, God would not trust the righting of ourselves in our own hands, knowing we would be too partial to our own interests and concerns, but hath assumed it to himself as the prerogative of His crown.—On ver. 20: *On kindness toward enemies.* This is all the revenge which the gospel permits; this is that excellent doctrine which our Saviour came to preach, which He hath given us commission to declare and publish to the world, to guide our feet into the way of peace; that we might all be united, as by faith and obedience unto God, so in love and charity one to another.

[BISHOP ATTERBURY: *Sermon on the duty of living peaceably* (Rom. xii. 18). I. In what the duty consists, in relation to public and private men, opinions and practice. II. The extent of it—to all men. III. The difficulty of practising it. IV. The best helps to the practice of this duty: (1.) To regulate our passions; (2.) To moderate our desires, and shorten our designs, with regard to the good things of life; (3.) To have a watchful eye upon ourselves in our first entrance upon any contest; (4.) Always to guard against the intemperance of our tongue, especially in relation to that natural proneness it has toward publishing the faults of others; (5.) To keep ourselves from embarking in parties and factions; (6.) To study to be quiet, by doing our own business in our proper profession or calling; (7.) Add prayer to the Author of peace and Lover of concord, for the fruits of His Spirit.

[BURKITT: What it is to be overcome of evil. 1. When we dwell in our thoughts too much, too often, and too long, upon the injuries and unkindness we have met with; this is as if a man that was to take down a bitter pill, should be continually champing of it, and rolling it under his tongue. 2. We are overcome of evil when we are brought over to commit the same evil, by studying to make spiteful returns, in a way of revenge, for the injuries we have received.—Wherein consists the duty and excellency of overcoming evil with good? 1. It renders us like God, who does good to us daily though we do evil against Him continually; 2. We imitate God in one of the choicest perfections of His divine nature; 3. We overcome ourselves; 4 We overcome our enemies, and make them become our friends.

[HENRY: Bless them who persecute you: 1. Speak well of them. If there be any thing in them

commendable and praiseworthy, take notice of it, and mention it to their honor; 2. Speak respectfully to them, according as their place is; 3. Wish well to them, and desire their good, so far from seeking any revenge; 4. Offer up that desire to God, by prayer for them.

[CLARKE, on ver. 16: There have not been wanting, in all ages of the Church, persons who, losing the savor of divine things from their own souls by drinking into a worldly spirit, have endeavored to shun the reproach of the cross, by renouncing the company of the godly, speaking evil of the way of life, and, perhaps, sitting down in the chair of the scorner with apostates like themselves. And yet, strange to tell, these men will keep up a form of godliness! for a decent outside is often necessary to enable them to secure the ends of their ambition.

[HODGE, on vers. 20, 21: Nothing is so powerful as goodness; it is the most efficacious means to subdue enemies and put down opposition. Men whose minds can withstand argument, and whose hearts rebel against threats, are not proof against the persuasive influence of unfeigned love; there is, therefore, no more important collateral reason for being good, than that it increases our power to do good.

[BARNES, on ver. 11: The tendency of the Christian religion is to promote industry. 1. It teaches the value of time; 2. Presents numerous and important things to be done; 3. It inclines men to be conscientious in the improvement of each moment; 4. And it takes away the mind from those pleasures and pursuits which generate and promote indolence —J. F. H.]

THIRD SECTION.—*Christian universalism (Roman Catholicism in Paul's sense) in proper conduct toward the civil Government (the heathen State), which has a diaconal and liturgical service in the household of God. The office of civil Government defined.*

CHAP. XIII. 1–6.

1 Let every soul be subject [submit himself] unto the higher powers [to the
authorities which are over him].[1] For there is no power [authority] but of
[except from][2] God: the powers that be are [those which exist[3] have been]
2 ordained of [by] God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power [So that he
who setteth himself against the authority], resisteth the ordinance of God:
and they that [those who] resist shall receive to themselves damnation [con-
3 demnation]. For rulers are not a terror to good works [the good work],[4] but
to the evil. Wilt thou then not [Dost thou then wish not to] be afraid of the
power [authority]? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of [from]
4 the same: For he is the minister of God [God's minister] to thee for good.
But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth [weareth] not the
sword in vain: for he is the minister of God [God's minister], a revenger to
5 *execute* wrath upon [an avenger for wrath to] him that doeth evil. Wherefore
ye must needs[5] be subject [submit yourselves], not only for [because of the]
6 wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For, for this cause pay ye [ye pay]
tribute also: for they are God's ministers [the ministers of God],[6] attending
continually upon this very thing.

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 1.—[The word ἐξουσία, rendered *power* in the E. V., has, as its German equivalent: *Obrigkeit*. Dr. Lange expands ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις into: *den Obrigkeiten, den ihn überragenden Mächten*. The rendering above is partly from Noyes, partly from the revision of Five Ang. Clergymen. Both of these versions substitute throughout, *authority* for *power* (E. V., Amer. Bible Union). The change is a happy one, since *authority* has both an abstract and a personal force, corresponding to that of ἐξουσία. *Civil authority* is, of course, intended.

[2] Ver. 1.—[א. A. B. D³. L., some fathers, read ὑπό; adopted by Lachmann. D¹. E¹. F., Origen, ἀπό; which is adopted by modern editors (except Tregelles), since it might readily be changed on account of the ὑπό immediately following, and also because the other reading would be tautological.

[3] Ver. 1.—[The *Rec.* inserts ἐξουσίαι after οὖσαι, with D³. L., some versions and fathers. It is omitted in א. A. B. D¹. F., most versions and fathers. Later editors reject it. It would easily be written as an explanation. The *Rec.* also inserts τοῦ before θεοῦ, on very insufficient authority.

[4] Ver. 3.—[Instead of τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων, ἀλλὰ τῶν κακῶν (*Rec.*, D³. L., some fathers, Scholz), the reading: τῷ ἀγαθῷ ἔργῳ, ἀλλὰ τῷ κακῷ is supported by . A. B. D¹. F., many versions and fathers, Lachmann, Tischendorf, De Wette, Meyer, Philippi, Alford, Tregelles. Stuart and Hodge do not notice the correct reading, which was doubtless altered into that of the *Rec.*, for the sake of supposed grammatical accuracy.

[5] Ver. 5.—[In D. F., and a few minor authorities, ἀνάγκη is omitted, and the infinitive ὑποτάσσεσθαι altered into the imperative ὑποτάσσεσθε. The Vulgate follows the reading ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθε. So Luther.

[6] Ver. 6.—[The E. V. has here, *God's ministers*, and in ver. 4, *the minister of God*. The expressions are altered in both verses in the version of Five Ang. Clergymen, which I have followed, for this reason, that, in ver. 4, the idea of serving on behalf of God is implied in διάκονος; while here, that of serving or ministering to God, on behalf of the people (λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ) seems to be included also. It were perhaps still better to render διάκονος, *servant*, and reserve the word *minister* for this verse, as Noyes has done. "We could not vary the English rendering of διάκονος and λειτουργός, except by introducing some word like 'officer,' which would have had an awkward sound" (Five Ang. Clergymen).—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

General Remarks.—As, in chap. xii., ecclesiastical duties are supplemented by personal duties, so here, in chap. xiii., civil duties are supplemented by duties toward the world in general.—According to Tholuck, the passive conduct in relation to private injuries, in chap. xii. 19–21, has led to this exhortation. Yet this would be too accidental an occasion. The thought of the transition is, that, even in the heathen State, evil must be overcome with good. But the possibility of this conquest lies in the necessity of the Christian's recognizing something good even in the large State, as well as in the personal opponent. Chrysostom held that this section has the apologetical design of showing that Christianity does not lead to the dissolution of the State, and of the social legal relations (comp. 1 Tim. ii. 1; Titus iii. 1; 1 Peter ii. 13, 14). According to Calvin, and others, the occasion lay in the fact that the Jews were inclined to resistance to heathen government, and that also the Jewish Christians often became subject, with them, to suspicions of the same disposition.* As might be expected, Baur finds the key for the solution of this question also in the Clementines. On these and other hypotheses, particularly those of Neander and Baumgarten-Crusius, see further details in Tholuck, pp. 678 ff. The same author says: "If the Epistle was written in the year 58, then it follows that Nero's five mild years terminated in the following year." In view of the universal character of this Epistle, even on its practical side, the Apostle must have felt the necessity of defining, from his principle, the relation of duty in which Christians stood to the State, without his having been led to it by this or that circumstance.

Ver. 1. **Let every soul,** πᾶσα ψυχή. *Every man;* yet with reference to the life of the soul, whose emotions in relation to the government come into special consideration (Acts ii. 43; iii. 23; Rev. xvi. 3).—**Submit himself,** ὑποτασσέσθω Voluntarily subjecting himself to authority. [The reflexive form describes the obedience as of a rational, voluntary, principled character, in distinction from blind, servile subjection.—P. S.]—**To the authorities which are over him** [ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις]. In ἐξουσία are comprised both the magistracy and their power (*potestas*). Ὑπερέχουσαι, Vulgate: *sublimiores.* Tholuck: *The high, those high in authority,* with a reference to 1 Tim. ii. 2. [Philippi and Meyer refer to the German phrase: *Die hohe Obrigkeit,* but there seems to be no reference to the higher grade of rulers. The rendering given above is sufficiently explicit.—It must be noticed how general the injunction is—*every soul,* and *whatever powers* are set over him. Wordsworth: He does not say *obey,* but *submit.* On the limitations, see below, and *Doctr. Notes.* —R.]

Except from God [εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ Θεοῦ See *Textual Note* [2]. The proposition is universal, its application follows. Wordsworth remarks that δύναμις, *force,* does not occur throughout.—R.] God's sovereignty is, in the general sense (ἀπὸ Θεοῦ), the causality of magisterial power.

Those which exist [αἱ δὲ οὖσαι. See *Textual Note* [3].] According to Erasmus and Schmidt, the Apostle understands by the αἱ δὲ οὖσαι, the rightful powers; with reference to John x. 12, ὁ ὢν ποιμήν, *qui verus pastor est.* According to Meyer and Tholuck, there is no difference whatever. [The words mean simply this: *all* existing civil authorities, *de facto* governments. This doubtless includes temporary and revolutionary governments, although nothing is said on this point. Of course, there has been much casuistry in the discussions as to what constitutes the *existence,* οὖσα, of the authority. —R.]

The general definition, ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, for which Codd. A. B.[2], and others, would read ὑπὸ Θ., is "more specifically defined by the ὑπὸ Θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσί," **have been ordained by God,** which denotes Divine appointment.* The

* [This exhortation was probably occasioned by the turbulent spirit of the Jews in Rome, who had been on this account banished from the city for a time by the Emperor Claudius (A. D. 51). Their messianic expectations assumed a carnal and political character, and were directed chiefly toward the external emancipation from the odious yoke of the heathen Romans. A few years after the date of the Epistle to the Romans, the spirit of revolt burst forth in open war, which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem (A. D. 70). The Jewish, and even the Gentile Christians, might readily be led away by this fanaticism, since the gospel proffered *liberty,* and they might not understand that it was mainly spiritual—moral freedom from the slavery of sin, out of which, by degrees, in the appointed way, a reformation and transformation of civil relations should proceed. Such mistakes have been common; *e. g.,* the Peasant's war, the Anabaptist tumults in the time of the Reformation, and many revolutions since the latter part of the last century. The attitude of Christ, His Apostles, and His Church down to the time of Constantine, toward the civil government, is truly sublime. They recognised in it an ordinance of God, despite its degeneracy, yielding to it, in all legitimate affairs, a ready obedience, despite the fact that they were persecuted by it with fire and sword. It should be remembered that this exhortation was addressed to the Romans, when the cruelties and crimes of a Tiberius, Caligula, and Claudius were in yet fresh remembrance, and when the monster Nero sat on the imperial throne—the same Nero who, a few years later, wantonly and mercilessly persecuted the Christians, condemning the Apostles Paul and Peter to a martyr's death. It was, however, by just such Christian conduct, in contrast with such cruelty, that Christ's Church won the moral victory over the Roman Empire and heathendom. Under the influence of such precepts, the early Church was "great in deeds, greater in sufferings, greatest in death, for the honor of Christ and the benefit of generations to come;" thus she was enabled to "overcome evil with good."—P. S.]

* [Without anticipating the discussion in the *Doctrinal Notes,* it may be well to remark here, that while this phrase has been used very frequently in the interest of the divine right of kings, such an application is rather an accident than a necessary inference from the Apostle's proposition. The theologians of Germany are apt to turn this against the revolutionary tendencies of Europe, &c.; but should the government under which they live in any way become republican, or ultra-democratic, then consistency must lead them to concede to such authorities also the *jus divinum.* The simple, pellucid meaning of the Apostle is, that civil government is necessary, and of Divine appointment. We infer that anarchy is as godless as it is inhuman; that magistrates are not "the servants of the people," nor do they derive their authority from the people, but from God, even though chosen by the people; that republican officials, no less than the hereditary monarchs, can subscribe themselves, "by the grace of God." Unless the principle be of universal application, anarchy will be justified somewhere. This principle, moreover, respects the office, not the character of the magistrate; not the abstract authority, indeed, but the concrete rulers, whatever their character. If it be deemed too sweeping, then its self-imposed limitation has been overlooked. For as the obedience is demanded because of God's appointment, then it is *not demanded* in matters *contrary* to God's appointment. When the civil power contradicts God's Word and His voice in our conscience, then it contradicts and subverts its own authority. Herein the superior wisdom of Christian ethics is manifest. Human self-will leads to anarchy, human power to despotism; but obedience to *de facto* rulers as a Christian duty has led, and must lead, to true civil freedom, since it alone makes the individual truly free, and, by asserting the higher law as the basis of the lower authority, ever elevates the lower authority nearer the Divine

Apostle, however, seems desirous of making a distinction, yet not between the rightful and illegal authorities, but between the actual appearance of the authorities and their ideal and essential ground of life, whose validity should also undoubtedly be recognized in the actual authorities, because of their permanent destination. In harmony with this distinction, Chrysostom, and others, have distinguished between the magisterial office itself and its accidental incumbents. Yet we must hold that the Apostle not only enjoins obedience toward the ideal institution of the authorities, but also toward their empirical appearance. But he will establish the requirement of this obedience by reference to the ideal institution and design of the authorities. This arises clearly from what follows.

Ver. 2. **So that he who setteth himself against**, &c. [ὥστε ὁ ἀντιτασσόμενος, κ.τ.λ. Notice the recurrence of τάσσω in various forms and combinations.—R.] Whoever becomes ἀντιτασσόμενος against the actual authorities, becomes also the resister of the **ordinance of God.** The ἀντιτάσσεσθαι denotes, primarily, military opposition, the array of a hostile order of battle; but it has also a more general sense. Its meaning, over against the authorities, in every case must be that of resistance; and Tholuck makes an arbitrary limitation when he says: "Neither the armed opposition of the individual, nor of many, as in insurrection, is meant here; it rather appears, from ver. 7, what kind of opposition is meant, namely, that of refusal to pay taxes." Besides, ver. 7 is the beginning of another section. [The more general sense is usually accepted, as in the above rendering: *He who setteth himself against*, which is adopted to bring out the reflexive force of the original.—R.] As related to the Divine appointment (διαταγή, here = διάταγμα), this resistance becomes a spiritual resistance. This is the rule; and, according to this rule, it is said of those who resist the Divine ordinance:

Those who resist shall receive to themselves condemnation [οἱ δὲ ἀνθεστηκότες ἑαυτοῖς κρίμα λήμψονται]. Meyer properly remarks, that "a condemnation by God is meant, as it is produced by their resistance of God's ordinance, but that the ἄρχοντες are regarded as executing this sentence; therefore Paul does not mean eternal (according to Reiche, and most commentators), but temporal punishment." Yet these executioners are not always the ἄρχοντες; for it is well known that revolution very often "devours its own children," and that the sorest punishments come from anarchy. [The next verse seems to point to the rulers as the instruments in inflicting the Divine punishment (Tholuck, Alford), yet there is no necessity for this limitation, in the face of the fact that punishment often comes by other hands. Though the punishment comes from God, *condemnation* is preferable to damnation, since the latter refers now to eternal punishment alone, which is not the meaning here.—On vers. 1, 2, Dr. Hodge remarks: "The extent of this obedience is to be determined from the nature of the case. They are to be obeyed as magistrates, in the exercise of their lawful authority. This passage, therefore, affords a very slight foundation for the doctrine of passive obedience."—R.]

Ver. 3. **For rulers are not** [οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες οὐκ εἰσίν]. It may be asked here, what the γάρ is designed to establish? According to Meyer, it explains the modality of the condemnation: they shall receive condemnation in so far as the civil authority is its executioner. But Tholuck and Philippi very properly suggest, that the κακὰ ἔργα in ver. 3 cannot mean merely resistance to civil authority. If the civil authority exists merely for the quelling of resistance, the whole State would be a mere circle, or the civil authority would be an absolute despotism. According to Calvin and Bucer, ver. 3 should connect with ver. 1, and prove the *utilitas* of the Divine ordinance of civil authority.* But the γάρ refers simply to the idea of absolute punishment in the condemnation in ver. 2. In Tholuck there is a similar, and perhaps somewhat more general, reference to ver. 2. God punishes insurrection, because it is designed to shake a legal ordinance, existing for the protection of the good and the punishment of the bad. All those are guilty of this misconception of all the moral powers of existing order, who, in their abstract worship of a pure fancy, oppose the best form of government, and therefore finish their labors by perverting existing order to a moral chaos. Now, the limitation of the strict requirements of the Apostle lies in the definition of the civil authority, which he gives in this and the following verses.

A terror, φόβος. For terror, *formidandi*. Princes are not formidable to the good work, but to the evil.—[**To the good work, but to the evil,** τῷ ἀγαθῷ ἔργῳ, ἀλλὰ τῷ κακῷ. See *Textual Note* [4].—R.]

Dost thou then wish not to be afraid of the authority? [θέλεις δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν; Although it is not necessary to retain the interrogative form, yet it will express sufficiently the hypothetical force, which most commentators find here.—R.] These words are a hypothetical premise, and not a question, as Griesbach, and others, would construe them.—**Thou shalt have praise** [ἕξεις ἔπαινον]. Commendations by the magistrates, in opposition to punishments, were common even in ancient times. Origen, on the contrary, says, that it is not the custom of rulers to praise the *non peccantes*. To this, Pelagius says: *Damnatio malorum laus est bonorum*. Meyer says: "Grotius, moreover, properly says: '*Cum hæc scriberet Paulus, non sæviebatur Romæ in Christianos?*' It was still the better period of Nero's government." Tholuck's view is similar. Yet the written words of the Apostle have been of perfect application subsequently, even down to the present day. The Apostle sets up an ideal, by which the ruler also can and shall be judged. We must hold:

1. That he portrays obedience to authority as an obedience for the Lord's sake (comp. Eph. vi. 5, 6). This secures the sphere: "Render to God the things that are God's;" bondage under religious and conscientious despotism is excluded.

2. The definition of what is *good works* and what

Law. For, as Alford observes of the duty here laid down: "To obtain, by lawful means, the removal or alteration of an unjust or unreasonable law, is another part of this duty; for all powers among men must be in accord with the highest power, the moral sense." And the elevation of the moral sense of individuals will accomplish more than revolutions, however justifiable and necessary.—R.]

* [The view of Calvin, Philippi, Hodge, Alford, and others, that this verse gives an additional ground for obedience, viz., that magistrates, besides being ordained of God, are appointed for a useful and beneficent purpose, has much to commend it. Dr. Lange seems to be led toward such exclusive references as bear against *revolution*.—R.

are *evil works*, abides by the decision of God's word, of Christian faith, and of conscience, but is not dependent on the ruler.

3. This also indicates that every power shall become weakness, when the poles of sword-bearing shall be so absolutely transposed that the sword becomes a terror to good works; but that it is a matter of the Divine government to prove that weakness, which lies in the fact that an actual government has absolutely dropped off from the idea of its design.*

Ver. 4. **For he is God's minister** [Θεοῦ γάρ διάκονός ἐστιν]. The γάρ of ver. 4 brings out the ground of the declaration in ver. 3. The rule of the magistracy as a terror to the evil, and for the praise and encouragement of those who do good, is explained by its character, its essential design, to be God's servant.—[**To thee for good,** σοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν.] But he is God's minister for the good of man; see Book of Wisdom vi. 4. [While rulers are of God, it is for the benefit of the ruled. A repetition of what precedes, and suggesting the same limitations.—R.]

He weareth not the sword in vain [οὐ γάρ εἰκῇ τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ]. He *weareth* it (φόρει is stronger than φερεῖ) as the symbolical token, insignia, of his governing and judicial sovereignty; but he does not wear it merely as a symbol, without reason, and for show. He makes use of it because he is **God's minister,** as the punitive executioner of His wrath. The addition: **for wrath,** εἰς ὀργήν, expresses the fact that even in the State and municipal court there is the authority of something higher than merely human justice, namely, the Divine retribution of wrath upon offenders.

On the different antiquarian interpretations of the μάχαιρα, particularly as the dagger which the Emperor carried at his side, see Tholuck, p. 690. Tholuck and Meyer decide for the sword, because μάχ. in the New Testament always means this, and because everywhere in the provinces it was borne by the highest officers of military and criminal affairs, as the sign of the *jus gladii*. Nevertheless, the dagger of the Emperor, and of his representative, the *Præfectus Prætorii*, belongs under the symbolical description. After all, in an abstract and real direction, we would otherwise have to think only of the executioner's sword. [It requires some ingenuity to escape the conviction that this passage implies a New Testament sanction of the right of capital punishment. At all events, the theory of civil penalties here set forth is in direct opposition to that so constantly upheld nowadays, that the end is simply the reformation of the offender. See *Doctr. Note* 6.—R.]

Ver. 5. **Wherefore ye must needs, &c.** [διὸ ἀνάγκη, κ.τ.λ.] For the reason stated, it was not merely the duty of prudence, but also a religious and moral duty of conscience, to be subject. When the Apostle says, **not only because of the wrath, but also for conscience' sake,** he denotes thereby the antithesis of the servile fear of the external infliction of punishment, and of inward and free obedience, in the knowledge and reverence of the Divine order in the civil affairs of men.* Comp. 1 Peter ii. 13.

Ver. 6. **For, for this cause ye pay tribute also** [διὰ τοῦτο γάρ καὶ φόρους τελεῖτε The question of connection has been much discussed. Calvin, De Wette, Alford, and many others, make διὰ τοῦτο parallel with διό (ver. 5), as another inference from vers. 1–4. Meyer, however, connects immediately with ver. 5, finding here an inference from the necessity there described, as well as a confirmation of it. He thinks the other construction passes over ver. 5 arbitrarily. But if the verses are taken as parallel, this difficulty is not of much weight. See his notes for other views; Stuart takes διὰ τοῦτο γάρ as a strengthened causal particle, and the verb as imperative.—R.] The τελεῖτε must not be read as imperative (Heumann, Morus [Stuart, Hodge], and others); but the γάρ [οὖν with the imperative would have been more natural] and the imperative in ver. 7 are against this. The payment of tribute declares a recognition of the State, also according to our Lord's own declaration (Matt. xxii. 21). But by means of paying tribute, the subject himself takes part in the government of the magistracy. He actually takes part in the support of the administration, which, consciously or unconsciously, is, in the highest sense, a servant of the kingdom, and, in the widest sense, is a servant [*Liturg*] of God, analogously to the servant of the temple. Olshausen, and others, erroneously construe προσκαρτεροῦντες as subject.

[**For they are the ministers of God,** λειτουργοὶ γάρ Θεοῦ εἰσιν. See *Textual Note* [6]. The subject is ἄρχοντες (supplied in thought); λειτουργοί is predicate (Meyer, Philippi, and most). See Philippi on the distinction between λειτουργός and διάκονος. He bases upon the former, which, he claims, applies to one engaged in a practical, external service, as well as on the concrete plural (instead of the abstract ἐξουσία), the reference to the collection of tribute in εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο. But it is better, with Tholuck, Wordsworth, and others, to find here the idea of servants ministering to God in representation of the people.—R.]

Attending continually upon this very thing [εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο προςκαρτεροῦντες]. Philippi † explains εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο: *for this very purpose*, viz., the payment of tribute. But then that would mean: they receive taxes in order that they may exact more taxes. The purpose is the fundamental thought of the whole section: The

* [In thus presenting an ideal of civil government (as most commentators suppose), the Apostle gives both the reason for obedience to rightful authority, and makes room for resistance to rulers who utterly and entirely depart from this ideal. Wordsworth, however, takes decided ground against any right of insurrection, and adds: "But even suppose a Nero, and a Nero persecuting the Church; yet even then you may have praise therefrom. You may overcome his evil by your good; you may be more than conqueror—you may derive glory from it. For though it is unjust and condemns you, yet God is just and will reward you. He will crown you for acting justly, and for suffering unjustly. Therefore hold fast your justice, and whether the power acquits or condemns you, you will reap praise from it. If you die for the faith from its hand, you will reap glory from its fury. Augustine (Serm. xiii. 302)." Yet even this author admits that the Apostle "charitably presumes rulers to *be* what, being God's ministers, they *ought to be*." This is virtually the presentation of an ideal, the non-realization of which implies certain limitations to absolute submission.—R.]

* [Melanchthon thus strongly puts the case: *Nulla potentia humana, nulli exercitus magis muniunt imperia, quam hæc severissima lex Dei: necesse est obedire propter conscientiam.*"—R.]

† [The original says Meyer, but gives the very words of Philippi; while Meyer (4th ed., without any indication of change of view) defends the wider reference, among other reasons, because the verb, which includes a moral idea, would be inapplicable to the mere collection of taxes. The great thought, *ministers of God*, seems to be the controlling one. Stuart, Hodge, and the older commentators, prefer the other reference which, perhaps, to a certain extent, implies this.—R.]

State is the State of the police, of rectitude, and of civilization. Therefore the λειτουργεῖν τῷ Θεῷ is undoubtedly meant (Tholuck, and others) in the very sense in which the section has described it.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. As chap. xii. has defined the conduct of Christians toward the Church and the personal departments of life, so does chap. xiii. define their conduct toward the State and the world. The Apostle has therefore very forcibly regarded the sphere of personal life as the atmosphere of the Church, and then the sphere of the world as the atmosphere of the State.*

2. In reference to the civil authority, the Apostle evidently makes the following distinctions: (1.) The *actual existence of the civil powers*, which are in every case an *ordinance* of God's providence [not of a *social contract*, nor simply *by the will of the people*.—R.]; and the *ideal and real existence* of the civil power, which is not merely *providentially* ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, but is also, *by creation* and *institution*, fundamentally an *ordinance* ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τεταγμέναι. (2.) He distinguishes between social opposition to the civil power, and the spiritual opposition to God's institution which is comprised therein. (3.) He also distinguishes between the power of the State itself and its incumbents, the rulers, by which designation he expresses the possibility of different political forms.† (4.) He finally distinguishes between the actual appearance and its ideal destination, according to which the ἐξουσία should be a διακονία and administrator of Divine right, and the ἄρχοντες should prove themselves as λειτουργοὶ Θεοῦ.

3. The following distinctions with reference to duty toward the State clearly appear:

A. The submission is of necessity (ἀνάγκη), ver. 5; (1.) Because of the wrath. Since Divine providence has its wise purposes even in raising up, and permitting to exist, severe and despotic powers, so long as they are *really State powers*, ὑπερέχουσαι, so, in this relation, is the ἀντιτάσσεσθαι a sin against wisdom; the revolter draws upon himself the κρῖμα for his want of judgment, his presumption, and his wicked encroachment and invasion. The same ὀργή which makes the State pass over from an institution of Divine mercy to a phenomenon of Divine wrath, and which makes use of the despotic tool as an axe to be cast aside in due season (Isa. x. 15), and which oppresses a people to its own chastisement, crushes, first of all, the individual anarchical despots of revolution, who, in excessive self-estimation, would cure the relative evil of despotism by the absolute evil of anarchy. (2.) Although this folly itself must be avoided for conscience' sake, there is added a specific obedience for conscience' sake, which is unfettered respect for the ideal splendor of the Divine institution, joy at an existence protected by the laws and civilization of the State, gratitude for the moral blessings which humanity possesses in civil life; but, in one word, the knowledge of the Divine, which shines clearly enough even through the imperfect phenomenon of civil life.

B. The "submitting," ὑποτάσσεσθαι, excludes the resisting, ἀντιτάσσεσθαι; but it by no means excludes it from God's word and from conscience, nor from judgment (dependent on an existing power) on what is good and what is evil, and what is just and what is unjust; for it is only in consequence of this judgment that there can be a candid conviction that the higher powers, really as God's servant, exercise the right of the sword for a terror to evil works and protection to good works. Consequently, judgment on the actions of the State within the purely ethical department, and the limits and legality of wisdom, is also unfettered.

C. According to the Apostle, the mark of voluntary obedience consists in not fearing the civil powers, in assuming their existence according to the idea in vers. 3 and 4, and not according to their accidental errors. This fearlessness may not only be united with the respect required by ver. 7, but is inseparably connected with it (see Tholuck, p. 692). As one has the right and duty to expect of the Christian that he will act in a Christian way, so has one the right and duty to expect of the State that it be clothed with the ideal principles of the State.

D. The Apostle says: "Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due;" as if he would say that, by this voluntary act, you participate in the civil government, and pledge your obedience to it. But, in ver. 7, he characterizes the same act as indebtedness. The solution of this apparent antinomy has been given by our Lord himself, Matt. xxii. 21 (see the *Commentary on Matthew*, pp. 396, 397). The individual has the right to emigrate when an extraneous power arises. But if, with the use of the coin of the country, he enjoys the profit, protection, and authority of the country, there arises the duty of paying the tribute required by the united life and necessities of the State. And he who pays tribute—that is, renders allegiance—with one hand, but with the other rises in revolution, is not only guilty of resistance, but also of self-delusion and self-contradiction.—These are the principal features; they may also be found in Eph. vi. 5; 1 Tim. ii. 2; 1 Peter ii. 13. The application of them to the individual cases and questions arising here, has been committed by God's word to the development of the Christian spirit. We are convinced that this spirit, and its foundation, can be misapplied by impure minds, when, on the one hand, Byzantine adulterers make the gospel of truth a gospel of absolute despotism, and, on the other, fanatical and hierarchical mutineers make it a gospel of revolutionary terrorism, as was the case with the Jewish Zealots, and appears now as secret political justice [*Vehmjustiz*] (practised in Westphalia in early times), now as brigandage, and now as Fenianism. In both respects the Old Testament is a commentary, rich in illustrations, on the sense of the New. Neither Pharaoh nor Korah's company, nei

* [Jowett escapes all the difficulties of this section, by intimating that the Apostle's exhortation has a reference only to the Roman Christians in their then circumstances. He thinks many a scriptural precept is abused because not thus limited, and adds, respecting the Apostle: "It never occurred to him that the hidden life, which he thought of only as to be absorbed in the glory of the sons of God, was one day to be the governing principle of the civilized world." It is not likely to be so long, if all its professed possessors pare down the scriptural precepts in this fashion.—R.]

† [From the expression, "God's minister to thee for good," the relative excellence of the different forms of government must be determined, since this is the only rule laid down, and an empirical one at best. So long as a popular government best fulfils this Divine purpose, so long will men gladly lay down their lives, that "the government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth" (Pres. Lincoln at Gettysburg Cemetery.—R.]

ther Rehoboam nor Jeroboam, neither Nebuchadnezzar nor the adversaries of Jeremiah, escaped the condemnatory judgment of the Spirit recorded on the pages of Holy Writ. But in the Jewish war, when the fanaticism of power and the fanaticism of an enthusiastic fancy for freedom contended together for the Holy City, the Christians emigrated to Pella. The light and right of the Christian consist in the incapacity of any earthly power to intervene between his heavenly King and his conscience. When it is therefore imputed to him that his conscience is stained by falsehood, injustice, cowardice, or partiality, and that he has become faithless to his heavenly King, he knows—for he must know—that his inward life stands or falls with his fidelity to his Lord, it matters not from what side the imputation may come. He must likewise refute the imputation that he employs his whole life in political law questions; for there are other things to be attended to in religious, ecclesiastical, moral, and social life, than contending for the most perfect political and social forms. The same fanatical externalization, which in the Middle Ages took pleasure in absolute ecclesiasticism, can become absolute politicalism in modern society. But if conditions arise in the life of nations in which the Apostle's definition is not of absolute application to the civil power, when the sword is a terror to the good, then does the definition cease to be of application *at its* time to ὑπερέχουσα. But even in such a case God could make a Russian winter do more for Germany, than man, alienated from God, could do for France by a series of revolutions. Of course, freedom never takes place without enthusiastic liberators, who know how to distinguish God's fiery sign from human incendiarism. But every one must know for himself what his duty is in his particular calling. [The positions of Dr. Lange are justly taken, but may require some modification for a region where the civil power is more directly formed and sustained by the individual members of the State. In that case, the personal responsibility in political affairs is, of course, largely augmented; to the duty of obedience and tribute, that of political knowledge and prudence is added. The ideal must be formed by Christian reflection, and by Christian effort we must seek to make it a reality. The abstract right of revolution, which Dr. Lange himself does not deny, will be the more an abstraction as lawful means are at hand to alter the organic law of the State. Thus popular government, *when, and only when, the people are permeated by Christian principle*, contains in itself the preventive of revolutionary excess. How insupportable it can become when this condition is wanting, history tells plainly enough.—R.]

4. From the experience through which the Apostle had previously passed, he had been often protected by the sword of the Roman authorities against the mutinies of Jewish fanaticism. Learned people have observed, that he has written these exhortations to Rome although Nero was Emperor there. Other scholars have remarked, on the other hand, that the five good years of Nero's reign had not yet come to an end. But it is certain that, in the ordinance of the State for posterity, as well as in the institution of the Church, the Apostle perceives the historical opposition to the germinating antichristianity in the world, according to 2 Thess. ii. But he did not regard his liberty of judgment thereby bound (see 2 Tim. iv. 17).

5. To what extent is the State a Divine institution? Elaborate discussions on this question are summed up and deliberated upon by Tholuck, pp. 681–689. According to the principles of Romanism, the State is merely a human ordinance (see Tholuck, p. 684; Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.*, ii. 2, pp. 7, 108).—The germ of the Divine institution of the State lies in the Divine institution of the family, in the authority of the head of the family in particular, as well as in the substantial relations of humanity. But as the Old Testament gift of the law is the institution of a theocracy, which still embraces in common the twin-offspring of State and Church, so is there contained also in the Old Testament a Divine sanction of the State—a sanction which pledges the future sanctified State to reciprocity with the future Church. And this presages that it is just as destructive to make the State the servant of the Church, as to make the Church the bondwoman of the State.

[The Scylla and Charybdis of European Christianity, as related to the State, are: Romanism, which subordinates the State to the Church, and Erastianism, which subordinates the Church to the State. The American theory is: that both are coördinate, the State protecting the Church in civil rights, the Church sustaining the State by its moral influence. Yet even here it is questioned whether this is the correct theory. It is an experiment, fraught with great blessings indeed, but, as yet, only an experiment. The dangers here are similar: (1.) Romanism, which would make its Church the State; in a popular government, as really as in a despotism, and even more fatally, since the genius of the Church must then become that of the State—what that is, is obvious. (2.) On the other hand, we find the theocratic tendency of Puritanism manifesting itself continually. This would identify Church and State, rather by making the State the Church, pressing upon it the duty of legislating men into morality, and even holiness. Here we must class the politico-religionism, which has become so common during the last ten years.—Still, the constant tendency of Christendom to make a practical synthesis of Church and State, is an unconscious prophecy of an era when both shall be united in a *christocracy*.—R.]

6. On the right of the death-penalty with reference to the sword of authority, see Tholuck, p. 691. We must, of course, distinguish between the right of using the sword and the duty of its use. [Admitting that the Apostle is describing an ideal of civil government, we still find here the *right* of capital punishment. Of course, just in so far as the actual government has been below this ideal, has this right been abused. Still, the right remains justified by the theory of punishment here advanced, by the necessities of self-preservation on the part of society represented by the punishing power. The right to punish also implies the right to pardon; and the measure of the right (*i. e.*, the conformity to the ideal here presented) will be also the measure of the sense of responsibility, both as to the punishing and pardoning power. The usual objections to capital punishment misapprehend (*a.*) the nature of punishment in general; (*b.*) the Divine authority in civil government.—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Obedience toward the powers that be is every Christian's duty. 1. Without difference of posses-

sions; 2. Of position; 3. Of culture; 4. And of confession (ver. 1).—In how far are there no powers that are not ordained by God? 1. So far as God himself is a God of order, who will therefore have order in civil affairs; 2. So far as God is also a God of love, who designs to do good for us by the powers which He has ordained (vers. 1-4).—Resistance to the powers that be, regarded as resistance to God's ordinance (ver. 2).—To do good is the best protection against all fear of civil authority (ver. 3). —Praise from the civil magistrates. 1. Who shall obtain it? Every one who does good—that is, every one who, *a*. does not submit slavishly; but, *b*. obeys the laws of the country by voluntary obedience. 2. In what should it consist? *a*. Not so much in showy medals and ribbons, for which many are so eager, as, *b*. in the simple recognition of the faithfully discharged duty of the citizen (ver. 3).—The civil authorities should likewise serve: 1. God; 2. Men (ver. 4).—The holy judicial office of the magistracy. 1. From whom is it derived? From God, who is a righteous God, and to whom no wicked person is pleasing (Ps. v. 4). 2. What belongs to it? The exercise of penal judgment, and, above all, the right of life and death. 3. How should they exercise it? In the ennobling, but also humiliating, consciousness that they are God's ministers (ver. 4).

LUTHER: Worldly power is for the sake of temporal peace; therefore the conscience is bound, by dutiful love, to be subject to it (ver. 5).—See how good it is to pay taxes and be obedient; for you thereby help to protect the pious and punish the wicked. Therefore do not be provoked at it (ver. 6).

STARKE: If persons in authority would attract their subjects to obedience, they should administer their office well, and, to that end, should remember: 1. That they are by nature no better than other men; 2. That they will therefore die, just as all others; 3. That they will have to give a far greater account than their subjects before God's judgment-bar, because of their official prerogatives and government (ver. 1).—LANGE: When those in authority read and hear that their station is from God, they should examine themselves as to whether they are to their subjects what the head is to the body and its members (ver. 1).—HEDINGER: The powers that be, God's minister! How much is expressed by this! Therefore there are no masters above God. He will hereafter hold to account, and throw aside, all titles of honor (ver. 4).—Ye subjects, give freely your possessions and blood, but not your conscience (ver. 6).

GERLACH: Though the office be divine, the incumbent may possess it illegally, and abuse it (ver. 1).—"Needs" here means not external compulsion, but the inward necessity of being obedient to God (ver. 5).

LISCO: The believer's holy love is the fulfilment of the law; first of all, in relation to the powers that be (vers. 1 ff.).—Obedience is a matter of conscience with the Christian; it is an inward and sincere obedience (ver. 5).

HEUBNER: The Christian attitude toward the authorities (vers. 1 ff.).—The limits of obedience toward the powers that be are defined by conscience, faith, and God's commandment; Acts v. 29 (ver. 1). —The Christian mode of obedience is free, pure, conscientious, and not from compulsion or fear (ver. 5).

SCHLEIERMACHER: On the proper relation of the Christian to his ruler. 1. How utterly improper it is for the Christian to be subject merely to avoid punishment; 2. How natural and necessary it is for him to be subject for conscience' sake (preached in January, 1809); vers. 1-5.

[HENRY: Magistrates act as God's ministers: 1. In the administration of public justice; 2. The determining of quarrels; 3. The protecting of the innocent; 4. The righting of the wronged; 5. The punishing of offenders; 6. And the preserving of national peace and order, that every man may not do right in his own eyes.—WATERLAND: It is the duty of those in authority: 1. To correct those that needlessly and causelessly disturb the public tranquillity; 2. To remove those that libel the established religion, without offering any better, or an equivalent; 3. To curb the insolence and humble the pride of such as fly in the face of authority, and pretend, without commission or qualifications, to instruct, and, under that color, to insult their superiors.—SCOTT: As to the efforts which are anywhere made by those on whom trusts constitutionally devolve, to preserve, increase, or assist the *real* liberty of mankind, personal, civil, or religious, or to check the career of despotism or oppression over men of any climate, complexion, or religion: let us zealously forward them with our prayers, and by every mean consistent with the peace and good order of the community; and, if we would enjoy the blessing of good government, we should pray earnestly and constantly for our rulers, and all in authority; else we have no just cause to complain of any real or supposed grievances to which we may be subjected by them.—CLARKE: When a ruler governs according to the constitution of his country, and has his heart and life governed by the laws of God, he is a double blessing to his people; while he is ruling carefully according to the laws, his pious example is a great means of extending and confirming the reign of pure morality among those whom he governs.—J. F. H.]

FOURTH SECTION.—*Proper conduct toward the world in general. Legal fellowship with the world. Recognition of the rights of the world in the justice and also in the strength of love for our neighbor. Separation from the ungodliness of the ancient world (the darkness of heathenism). Universalism and its sanctification through true separatism.*

CHAP. XIII. 7–14.

7 Render therefore [*omit* therefore][1] to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute
is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.
8 Owe no man any thing, but [except] to love one another: for he that [who]
9 loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery,
Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness
[*omit* Thou shalt not bear false witness],[2] Thou shalt not covet; and if *there be*
any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely,[3]
10 Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.[4] Love worketh no ill to his neigh-
bour: therefore love *is* the fulfilling [love therefore is the fulfilment] of the
11 law. And that [this the rather because],[5] knowing the time, that now *it is* high
time to awake[6] out of sleep: for now *is* our salvation nearer than when we
12 believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off
13 the works of darkness, and[7] let us put on the armour of light. Let us walk
honestly [seemly],[8] as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in cham-
14 bering and wantonness, not in strife and envying: But put ye on the Lord
Jesus Christ, and make not [do not make][9] provision for the flesh, to *fulfil*
the lusts *thereof.*

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 7.—[*Rec.*, ℵ^{3}. D^{3}. F. L., insert οὖν (Philippi, De Wette); omitted in ℵ^{1}. A. B. D^{1}., by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Tregelles, and many others. Dr. Lange thinks the omission favors his view, that a new section should begin here; while Philippi and De Wette think this view of the connection led to the early omission.

[2] Ver. 9.—[The *Rec.* inserts οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις on insufficient authority (ℵ., versions and fathers). It is omitted in A. B. D. F. L., many cursives, &c.; by Lachmann, and modern editors and commentators without exception. Even Dr. Hodge, who rarely deviates from the *Rec.*, except under overwhelming authority, rejects it. The insertion is at once explained by the Decalogue itself.

[3] Ver. 9.—[B. F. omit ἐν τῷ. It is found in ℵ. A. D. L.; adopted by many editors, bracketted by Lachmann, Alford, Tregelles. It might easily have been omitted as unnecessary, hence to be retained.—*Rec.*, with A. L.: ἐν τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ; ℵ. B. D. F., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and most: ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ.

[4] Ver. 9.—[ℵ. A. B. D. (Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Tregelles): σεαυτόν, instead of ἑαυτόν (F., fathers, *Rec.*, Meyer, Philippi, &c.). The latter is for the *second* person, however; and may have been changed, either as a grammatical correction, or from the repetition of the Σ, which precedes. On ἑαυτόν for the second person, see Winer, p. 142.

[5] Ver. 11.—[Dr. Lange's text reads: *Und Solches wissend, wissen wir auch.* See the *Exeg. Notes* on this interpretation, and that given above in brackets.

[6] Ver. 11.—[The subject of the infinitive is omitted in the E. V. The *Rec.*, ℵ^{3}. D. F. L., have ἡμᾶς; ℵ^{1}. A. B. C.: ὑμᾶς. The former is adopted by most editors; Alford, however, having discovered that B. gives the latter, has adopted it. Lachmann, Tischendorf, and most, place ἤδη before ἡμᾶς (so ℵ. A. B. C. D.). Hence: *it is already time that we should awake*, is the correct rendering.

[7] Ver. 12.—[The *Rec.* (with ℵ^{3}. C^{3}. D^{2} ^{3}. F. L., and fathers) reads καί before ἐνδυσώμεθα. A. B. C^{1}. D^{1}., versions and fathers: ἐνδ. δέ. ℵ^{1}. omits the conjunction altogether. Lachmann, Tischendorf, De Wette, Alford, Wordsworth, Tregelles, accept δέ, since καί might be substituted on account of the failure to recognise the contrast. Philippi and Meyer accept καί, because δέ might have been inserted from the previous part of the verse, or to correspond with it. No change is required in the E. V., to express the slightly contrastive force of δέ.

[8] Ver. 13.—[Amer. Bible Union, Noyes: *becomingly;* Five Ang. Clergymen: *seemly.* The latter is more in keeping with the style of the E. V. 1 Cor. xiv. 40: *decently* (and in order). *Seemly* is found in Chaucer in precisely the sense here intended by εὐσχημόνως.

[9] Ver. 14.—[Dr. Lange's view would be thus expressed: Do not make such provision for the flesh as to satisfy its lusts. Noyes: Think not about satisfying the lusts of the flesh. Alford: Take not (any) forethought for the flesh, to fulfil its lusts. See the *Exeg. Notes.*—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Preliminary Remark.—This section is connected by ver 7 with the preceding. While the previous section defines the relation of Christians to the State to which they belong as citizens, the present section, on the other hand, regulates their relation to the world in general, in its friendly and hostile side, in fellowship and repulsion; and ver. 7 treats of their relation to *authorities* in the world in general. We have not merely to do with our own civil authorities and our own State, but also with foreign States and dignitaries. The traveller does not have to pay tribute to a foreign State, but he has to pay duty; in all cases we should exhibit becoming honor and respect toward every one. According to Tholuck, ver. 7 contains "a summary of the various duties toward all kinds of authorities; first of all, toward the subordinate tax-officers, then to judges and magistrates."

[The view of Tholuck, which is that of Meyer, Philippi, Alford, and most, implies that ver. 7 belongs to the preceding section. At first sight this division seems correct; but, really, ver. 7 is both a hortatory summing up of what precedes, and a transition to the more general admonitions which follow. If οὖν be read (see *Textual Note* [1]), the former becomes more prominent; if omitted, the latter.—R.]

Ver. 7. **Render to all their dues** [ἀπόδοτε πᾶσιν τὰς ὀφειλάς]. *Πᾶσιν*. According to Estius, Klee, and others, this refers to all men; according to Meyer [Philippi, and many others], it refers merely to magistrates, as if our respect were due to them alone! The antithesis is: Owe no man any thing.

Tribute to whom tribute is due [τῷ τὸν φόρον τὸν φόρον]. Tholuck, Meyer, and others, would supplement ἀπόδοτε by a ἀπαιτοῦντι. But the addition is already indicated in the τὰς ὀφειλάς, and ὀφείλετε follows immediately afterward. Fear and honor are asked from nobody, not even by magistrates, in the form of paying tribute and duty; and even with tribute and duty we should not wait until compelled to pay them. Grotius has supplied ὀφείλεται; Köllner, ὀφείλετε; against which Meyer observes, that it is philologically incorrect, because τῷ does not stand for ᾧ. But were ᾧ the reading, the idea of an organic distribution would easily arise; this was avoided by the Apostle's placing τῷ contractively for τούτῳ. According to Grotius, simply the *Art. præpositivus* is placed for the *subjunctivus*, which is reversed in chap. xiv. 2–5.*

Custom [τὸ τέλος]. Grotius: *Vectigalia pro mercibus dantur, tributa pro solo aut capite.* We must, at all events, understand here, by custom, the Roman internal tax on goods. [As *tribute* was due to home authorities, while *custom*, duties, &c., are due to foreign authorities as well, there seems to be an extension of thought beyond the obligations referred to in vers. 1–6. Bengel is quite incorrect in making φόρος the genus, and τέλος the species. —R.]

[**Fear**, τὸν φόβον; **honor**, τὴν τιμήν. Those who confine the reference to magistrates, apply the former word to the proper sentiment and conduct toward the higher magistrates, especially judges, the latter to magistrates in general (Meyer, Philippi). De Wette, however, refers the former to judges, the latter to magistrates in general, especially the higher ones; while Alford refers "φόβος to those set over us and having power; τιμή, to those, but likewise to all on whom the State has conferred distinction." If the wider view of the verse be accepted, then (with Hodge, Webster and Wilkinson, and others) the one means the reverence paid to superiors, the other, the courtesy due to equals.—R.]

Ver. 8. **Owe no man any thing** [μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε. Dr. Lange renders: *Bleibt Niemand und Nichts schuldig*, which he considers an improvement of the old version: *Niemand nichts.* —R.] The four preceding categories are here generalized to the idea of the universal *duty to our neighbor*. Tholuck is doubly inexact when he says: "The Apostle proceeds from the duties of subjects to universal *Christian duties*." [De Wette: "The Apostle proceeds at once from the vestibule of morality into her very domain."—R.]

Except to love one another [εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν. Philippi: "A Pauline *argute dictum* or *acumen*."—R.] In relation to the definite discharges of duty, the Christian should strive to perfectly discharge, and to keep discharged, his duty in every direction; in relation to love, as the source of duties, he should, on the other hand, be conscious, and constantly be more so, of an infinite and permanent indebtedness. The duties are externally a *finitum*, but the duty of loving our neighbor remains an *infinitum*. And the more clear the Christian becomes on one, the more clear he becomes on the other. [Bengel: "AMARE, *debitum immortale. Si amabatis, n l debetis, nam amor implet legem. Amare, libertas est.*" So most commentators from the times of Chrysostom. Augustine: "*Semper* DEBEO *charitatem quæ sola etiam reddita retinet debitorem*" (Ep. 62).—R.]

Ὀφείλετε is not indicative (Reiche, and others), but imperative,* by which the sentence, "except to love one another," must be understood thus: except that which you cannot pay as a debt. Meyer emphasizes the subjective rendering: Consider yourselves as debtors of love. Even in the "Owe no man any thing" there is undoubtedly an appeal made to the consciousness and its method of action.

Hath fulfilled the law. *Πεπλήρωκε.* [Perfect of completed action (Meyer).—R.] It is by love that the fulfilment of the law is fundamentally decided; chap. xiv. 18. Reiche, and others: *Id quod in lege summum est.* Instead of this, we must place: *Quod legis principium est.* That no justification is here implied, is plain, first, from the fact that the Apostle regards this loving as possible only on the ground of justification; and second, from the fact that he lays down *this loving*, emphatically construed, as an ideal which has not been reached so long as we are still universal debtors in individual matters.

[Although ver. 9 shows that the Mosaic law is meant, yet it is to be doubted whether there is any "apologetic reference to the upholders of the law" (Alford). When De Wette says: "He who practises love, *the higher duty*, has, even before he does this, fulfilled the law, *the lower*," he seems to ignore the true position of the law in the Christian dispensation. "The law, as a rule of gratitude, is completely fulfilled by love," seems a better view. For the former part of the verse implies that we never attain to this, but still "owe" this love increasingly. Hence the reference here is to the completed ideal. "The expression implies more than a simple performance of the precepts of the law; true love does more than this: it adds a *completeness* to the performance. It reaches those lesser courtesies and sympathies which cannot be digested into a code and reduced to rule. To the bare framework of law, which is as the bones and sinews, it adds the flesh which fills it, and the life which actuates it" (Webster and Wilkinson).—R.]

* [The mass of commentators supply ἀπαιτοῦντι (so Winer, p. 548), probably because they limit the reference in this verse to magistrates. But Dr. Lange's view is preferable. "The sentence is elliptical for ᾧ τὸν φ. ὀφείλετε τούτῳ τὸν φ." (Webster and Wilkinson). So E. V., substantially.—R.]

* [This is required by the context with its frequent imperatives, and also by the subjective negatives. The indicative would require οὐδενὶ οὐδέν. Of course, the meaning is very wide, including all possible obligatons, and not to be limited to a caution against pecuniary indebtedness. Fritzsche, and others, take ὀφείλετε in a different sense in the second clause (a kind of paronomasia): "Owe no man any thing, but ye ought to love one another." This is quite unnecessary, however.—R.]

Ver. 9. **For this, Thou shalt not, &c.** [τὸ γὰρ σὺ, κ.τ.λ.] It is self-evident that the Apostle does not take the negative commandments of the Decalogue in a merely literal sense. This is clear also from the prominence which he gives to the last: **Thou shalt not covet** (Luther: Covet *nothing;* an emphasizing of the object; chap. vii. 7 is against this). It also follows, from the fact that this perfect negative conduct is not conceivable without a corresponding positive conduct. Tholuck: "In the enumeration of the commandments in ver. 9, that respecting adultery precedes the one respecting murder. There is the same order in Codd. Alex. LXX., Exod. vi.; the same in Philo, and in the New Testament, James ii. 11; Mark x. 19; Luke xviii. 20. Philo establishes it, by saying: adultery is the most heinous crime." For further particulars, see Tholuck, p. 694.

Briefly comprehended. Ἀνακεφαλαιοῦν; see Eph. i. 10. In the expression there is comprised the idea, that all which is explained from the principle (for example, the Ten Commandments from the law of love) is *again summed up* in the fulfilment of the principle. Therefore not merely συντόμως ἀπαρτίζεται (Chrysostom). [So Meyer, Tholuck, Philippi: *recapitulated;* De Wette, Alford: *brought under one head.* Dr. Lange includes both ideas. *Briefly* might be omitted from the E. V. with propriety.—R.]

Ver. 10. **Love worketh no ill to his neighbor.** [Philippi remarks that the Greeks usually write ἐργάζεσθαί τινά τι, while Paul here has: τῷ πλησίον κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται.—R.] The Apostle's maxim, in the form of an oxymoron, substantiates what has already been said, since love appears as the great positive fulfilment of the law, because it worketh no ill to the neighbor. The perfection (defined, in the main, negatively) of the Decalogue becomes the measure of the perfection (defined, in the main, positively) of the gospel.

[**Love therefore is the fulfilment of the law,** πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη. *Fulfilment,* rather than "fulfilling," which would be the proper rendering of πλήρωσις. Meyer: "In the love to one's neighbor, *that takes place* by means of which the law is fulfilled." He further adds, that, in 1 Cor. xiii. 4–7, Paul gives a commentary on love's working no ill, &c. Comp. Gal. v. 14, Lange's *Comm.*, pp. 135 ff.—R.]

Ver. 11. **And this, knowing the time** [καὶ τοῦτο εἰδότες τὸν καιρόν. Dr. Lange: "And knowing this, we know also the time," &c. See below.—R.] According to Bengel, καὶ τοῦτο must be supplemented by ποιεῖτε; according to Estius, by *agere debemus* (Tholuck, ποιῶμεν). Meyer goes back to the precept in ver. 8: μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε. Yet not only is that precept quite remote, but there is also here a change from the second person to the first. If we look at the actual connection, the Apostle cannot simply say: Let us do that—love our neighbor as ourselves. The more direct thought is: Let us discharge all our obligations, for we know that the end is nigh. But the Apostle does not say: "the end is nigh," but, "the day of salvation is nigh." Therefore it is advisable to accept an ellipsis: καὶ τοῦτο εἰδότες τὸν καιρὸν οἴδαμεν, or, εἰδότες ἐσμέν. Because we know that love, which fulfils the law, is present, we know the importance of the time, namely, that the time of perfect salvation is nigh. To what extent? Because, by love, the works of night must vanish—adultery, murder, theft, covetousness; therefore the day of the complete righteousness of life must dawn. If this combination be deemed doubtful, Meyer's construction should then be preferred.

[Dr. Lange's view is indeed doubtful. On the whole, it seems unnecessary to supply any thing, but rather (with Hodge, Meyer, Philippi, and many others) to take καί as = *et quidem, and indeed, the rather,* and to refer τοῦτο to what precedes—*i. e.,* to the injunction of ver. 8, as afterwards expanded. This is classical usage, though ταῦτα is more common in such cases than τοῦτο. The demonstrative pronoun is thus used "to mark the importance of the connection between two circumstances for the case in hand" (Hodge). Luther and Glöckler confuse the construction, by joining τοῦτο with εἰδότες. The participle is not = *considering* (Grotius, Hodge, and others), but is causal, *since ye know.*—The *time.* This is explained by the next clause, **that it is high time.**—R.]

To awake out of sleep [ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι. Dr. Lange paraphrases thus in his text: "to fully arise, or, that we should immediately have arisen."—R.] How very metaphorical a meaning the Apostle gives to the word, as a designation of the sleep of sin, and of the darkness and bondage of the judgment of conscience by the blindness of sin, is plain from his subsequently describing just this excited, external watching, as works of darkness. According to Reiche, ὕπνος is an image of the Christian's condition on earth; this is opposed by Meyer, p. 481. [This condition of *sleep* is that of Christians also, as the verse obviously implies, but only relatively so (Philippi, De Wette, and others).—R.]

For now is our salvation nearer [νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἡ σωτηρία]. With Luther, and most commentators, we refer the ἡμῶν to ἡ σωτηρία, and not, with Meyer, to ἐγγύτερον; because it would not be like Paul to say that salvation, absolutely considered, is already brought nearer to us believers. Σωτηρία is here the completion of the redemptive salvation of the messianic kingdom. Therefore Meyer says: "This kingdom begins by means of the *second coming of Christ,* which Paul regarded near (Usteri, *Lehrbegriff,* p. 355). It was by not recognizing this—although Paul brings so impressively into the calculation the short time from his conversion to the period of his writing—that men have been induced to accept very preposterous interpretations; for example, that salvation by death is meant (Photius, and others), or the destruction of Jerusalem, which was of good results for Christianity (according to the earlier commentators, and also Michaelis), or the inward σωτηρία, the spiritual salvation of Christianity (Morus, and others)."

According to Tholuck, we can only grant that Paul indulged the hope of the speedy coming of Christ—perhaps even to live to see it—but yet that he had no fixed period of time for it. According to Meyer's rude view, we would have to imagine, with the Ebionites, a twofold σωτηρία; one of which, the spiritual salvation, has already happened; the other, the second coming of Christ, is near at hand, while between the two there is to be a gloomy period. But this is not the view of the Apostle. Rather, the first or principal σωτηρία, which is already the saving possession of Christians, is in the course of permanent and full development toward the final, peripherical salvation. There is a daily

progress from σωτηρία to σωτηρία. And, particularly with Paul, a new era of the development of σωτηρία will come, after Christianity shall have spread from Rome throughout the whole West, which, according to the purpose of the Epistle, is near at hand; and, with this Christianization of the Roman world, the completed σωτηρία will be brought nearer. These great, vital, and dynamic views of the Apostle are very different from the modern assumptions of the *Parousia* imputed to him. Tholuck: "The period from the appearance of the *regnum gloriæ*, when compared with its glory, is described as a nocturnal period. Spiritual sleep will be shaken off when the *regnum gratiæ* comes to men (Col. i. 12, 13); and how much more will this be the fact when the *regnum gloriæ* approaches!"

[Stuart, Hodge, Webster and Wilkinson, and a large class of commentators, understand by σωτηρία, the consummation of salvation in eternity—deliverance from the present evil world. Dr. Hodge objects at some length to the reference to the second coming of Christ. On the other hand, most modern German commentators defend this reference. Olshausen, De Wette, Philippi, Meyer, and others, think no other view in the least degree tenable; and Dr. Lange, while careful to guard against extreme theories on this point, denies the reference to eternal blessedness, and admits that the *Parousia* is intended. This opinion gains ground among Anglo-Saxon exegetes. The main objection to it is thus met by Dean Alford: "Without denying the legitimacy of an individual application of this truth, and the importance of its consideration for all Christians of all ages, a fair exegesis of this passage can hardly fail to recognize the fact that the Apostle, here as well as elsewhere (1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 51), speaks of the coming of the Lord as *rapidly approaching*." As to this being inconsistent with inspiration, he refers to Mark xiii. 32: "Of that day and hour knoweth no man," &c. "The fact that the nearness or distance of that day was *unknown to the Apostles*, in no way affects the prophetic announcements of God's Spirit by them, concerning its preceding and accompanying circumstances. The '*day and hour*' formed no part of their inspiration; the *details of the event did*. And this distinction has singularly and providentially turned out to the edification of all subsequent ages. While the prophetic declarations of the events of that time remain to instruct us, the *eager expectation* of the time, which they expressed in *their day*, has also remained, a token of the true frame of mind in which each succeeding age (and each succeeding age *à fortiori*) should contemplate the ever-approaching coming of the Lord. On the *certainty of the event*, our faith is grounded; by the *uncertainty of the time*, our hope is stimulated and our watchfulness aroused." This ignorance of the time of the coming of Christ Dr. Hodge himself brings forward, yet not to account for the expectation so much as to deny it. It is difficult for an unlettered believer to read the New Testament and not find this expectation, while even the most learned commentators now find it.—R.]

Than when we believed. (Calvin, and others), Luther says incorrectly: *Than when we believed it.* [The aorist refers to the definite time, when we *first* believed. So 1 Cor. iii. 5; xv. 2, &c.—R.]

Ver. 12. The night is far spent, &c. [ἡ νὺξ προέκοψεν, κ.τ.λ.] According to Meyer, the night would be the time before the second coming of Christ; and the near day, on the other hand, the second coming itself. Certainly we do not read "The night is gone, but the day is come." But it does not follow from this that Paul supposed that the day would not break until the second coming. The day will break a hundred times, in ever greater potencies, between the first and the second coming of Christ. Consequently, a chronological antithesis is not here in question. The night is the spiritual condition of heathen Rome; the breaking day is the future of Christian Rome. Ἡ νὺξ προέκοψεν. [The sense of the passage in itself considered is perfectly plain; but the precise reference is determined by the view taken of ver. 11. Admitting such recurring daybreaks as Dr. Lange suggests, they are still only preludes to "that day" when there shall be "no night."—R.]

Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness [ἀποθώμεθα οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους. The verb should be rendered: *put off*, if the figure of clothing be admitted; *put away*, if Dr. Lange's view be accepted.—R.] Meyer: "As one lays off his clothing. This view (against Fritzsche) corresponds to the correlative ἐνδυσώμεθα; comp. on Eph. iv. 22." [So De Wette, Philippi, Harless, Hodge, Alford, Webster and Wilkinson, Jowett, and most.—R.] But the works of darkness are not the same as the clothing of night. There is a difference between nocturnal revels and nocturnal clothing. The moral side of the heathen, and especially the Roman, night-life, moves before the Apostle, and he makes it designate evil works in moral darkness in general. The Roman of that time, giving himself up to dissolute nocturnal feasts and works of debauchery, but, on the return of day, assuming the favorite Roman costume of arms—a very perceptible contrast to these Roman Christians—is presented to them by the Apostle as a picture of a moral and religious contrast.

And let us put on the armour of light [ἐνδυσώμεθα δὲ τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός. See *Textual Note* [7]]. Not instruments (Morus), clothes (Beza, and others), shining arms (Grotius), but the armor which the Roman wears by day, as a figure of the spiritual means of conflict, and of the conflicts which belong to the light; they are presented by it, and wielded in its element (see Eph. vi. 13). The light is the master from whom, for whom, and with whom, this armor is.*—Ἐνδύσασθαι. Tholuck: "The figure of most intimate union with Christ, as the garment with the body; Gal. iii. 27; Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10. Also in the classics, see Wetstein."

Ver. 13. **Let us walk seemly, as in the day** [ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχημόνως περιπατήσωμεν]. As if that day had already come, when it will be a characteristic of public respectability to live a moral Christian life, and therefore to live decorously. Εὐσχημόνως [referring to the moral decorum of the conduct (Meyer).—R.], 1 Thess. iv. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 35; xiv. 40, because that day is already breaking.

Not in rioting, &c. [Webster and Wilkinson: "Three classes of sins are specified, to each of which two words are appropriated, viz., intemperance, impurity, discord: the first, public or social vice; the second, private and secret vice; the third,

* [Dr. Hodge: "Those virtues and good deeds which men are not ashamed of, because they will bear to be seen." Too one-sided a conception of the figure. Alford: "The arms *belonging to a soldier of light.*" The Christian's clothing as a child of the day is: *armor!*—R.]

ecclesiastico-political vice, the vice infecting communities even Christian." To this must be added Meyer's remark, that the three members stand in the internal relation of cause and effect. Comp. Gal. v. 19–21 (Lange's *Comm.*, p. 138), where five of the six words are found.—R.]—Κώμοις, *carousals.** Meyer translates, "*with* nocturnal riotings," by regarding the following dative as the dative of manner. This will not apply well to περιπατεῖν. [Philippi takes the datives as local, which seems the simplest view. Fritzsche, *dat. commodi.*—R.]—**Chambering,** κοίταις [*congressibus venereis*], feasts of debauchery, *rendezvous*, chambers and houses of debauchery, works of debauchery itself.—[**Wantonness,** ἀσελγείαις. On this word, see Tittmann, *Syn.*, p. 151. The plural shows that the various manifestations of wantonness are referred to.—R.]—**Envying,** ζήλῳ, *jealousy*. The reverse side of nocturnal lusts and pleasures is nocturnal quarrels, especially matters of jealousy, and the forms still prevailing among the works of darkness in our day, especially in Italy and Spain.

Ver. 14. **But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ.** Ἐνδύσασθαι, Gal. iii. 27; Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10. [Hodge: "To be intimately united to Him, so that He, and not we, may appear." So De Wette, Philippi, &c.—R.] Tholuck: "Christ was already put on at baptism, Gal. iii. 27; but this ἐνδύσασθαι, just as the being light, must also be continually renewed. Besides, we must take into consideration the aorist form: The putting on as a garment denotes the entrance of the most intimate communion." Meyer: "Even in the classics, ἐνδύσασθαί τινα denotes assuming somebody's manner of thought and action."

And make not provision for the flesh, &c. [καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιεῖσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας. Dr. Lange: *Und die Pflege des Fleisches macht euch nicht zur pflege der Lüste; and of the care of the flesh do not make for yourselves a care of its lusts.* The order of the Greek seems to favor this, but this implies a proper care of the flesh; so that this can only be a tenable view provided σάρξ *does not* have an ethical sense here. On this point, see below.—R.] Luther's translation is doubly incorrect: *Take care of the body, yet so that,* &c. First, the sentence is not divided into a positive and negative precept; second, the question is concerning the σάρξ, and not concerning the σῶμα. The sentence contains the expression of the moral limitation of the external perception of a self-evident duty. The duty is πρόνοια τῆς σαρκός; the enjoined limitation is the μὴ εἰς ἐπιθ. According to Fritzsche, σάρξ can only be understood as *caro libidinosa*, and therefore the whole sentence is a prohibition. Tholuck and Meyer, on the other hand, observe that the σάρξ, understood in this sense as sensual lust, should even be crucified; Gal. v. 24. Meyer describes the σάρξ, as it is here understood, as the lower animal part of man, the fountain and seat of sensual and sinful desires, in antithesis to the πνεῦμα. His calling σάρξ the material of the σῶμα, is better. [Philippi: "σάρξ has here a purely physiological sense."—R.] Tholuck cites Galen's medical *usus loquendi* to prove that the πρόνοια must be understood as care *sensu bono*; but Eph. v. 29 and 1 Cor. xii. 23 are of special application here. The distinction between what is vicious in the true care of the flesh, as is shown particularly in respectable clothing—to which the antithesis, "put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ," specially refers—is not merely expressed by the μὴ εἰ ἐπιθυμίας: not so that the ἐπιθυμίαι arise from it; but also by the middle: ποιεῖσθε, *make for yourselves*, in which reference is made to the subjective self-deception, the πράξεις τοῦ σώματος in the gratification of sensuous necessities.

[The view given above is, in the main, that of De Wette, Philippi, and many others. It opposes Luther's limitation of the negative to εἰς ἐπιθυμίας, but does not take the whole passage as prohibitory. Hodge, Stuart, Alford, and others, render (as in E. V.): Make *no* provision (whatever) for the flesh (the carnal nature, in the ethical sense) to fulfil its lusts (so as to fulfil them, and also, because such provision would fulfil them; the result and object blended in the thought). The objections to this view are, that πρόνοια is used generally in a good sense; that the prohibition is too mild, if flesh were used in the ethical sense, &c. But the ethical sense has been the prevalent one in the Epistle. The grammatical difficulty is very slight, since μή has suffered a slight trajection. Besides, the order seems to have been chosen to give prominence and emphasis to σαρκός; such emphasis is altogether unnecessary, unless it has its ethical force. Its prominent position brings it into obvious contrast with Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν; this contrast of itself seems to determine the meaning. These latter considerations seem to have escaped the German commentators. Comp. Alford also, who claims that the order would have been different had Paul designed to convey the meaning defended by Meyer, &c.—R.]

* [Such as the feasts of Bacchus, and also "the common boisterous carousing of intemperate young men" (Hodge).—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The debt of love denotes the duty of love for our neighbor, as, according to the law, it is a requirement of infinite force; and, according to the believer's new principle of life, it is an infinitely impulsive power. The unity of this debt divides itself into the differently formed obligations of various duties to our neighbor.

2. Love is the fulfilment of the law: (1.) So far as the whole law is only an outline of love to be filled up. (2.) So far as it precludes every transgression of the law. (3.) On the other hand, every commandment is realized as a vital principle in the new life. It is as love that God has given the law as our call to our destination. It is as love that Christ has fulfilled the law for our reconciliation. It is as love that the law of the Spirit lives in our faith, and, by the fellowship of Christ, supplies the defects of our deeds, so that, in the imitation of Christ, that fellowship may ever be elevated higher and higher.

3. The new era of love, a dayspring of the new era of light, with which the completion of salvation approaches.

4. If we would define more specifically the relation of Paul, as well as of all the apostles, to the second coming of Christ, we must distinguish: (1.) Between the *religious* measure [*Zeitmass*, measure of time] of God's kingdom, and the *chronological* measure of the world; (2.) Between the apostolical prospect of a future of glory which will be unfolded every day in new morning periods, and the meagre

sess of the Ebionitic idea, which has only a marvellous meteor of the *Parousia*, on the one hand, far behind it, and, on the other, far before it, while it finds itself placed in a troublous period and an ordinary course of the world. The present age in principle ceased at the death and resurrection of Christ, and the future age is already present in the heart of the Church and in the world's great crisis of development, though everywhere still externally surrounded by the nocturnal shades of the old age. And because it has been long present in principle, and in power breaks forth every day more gloriously, our full salvation is brought continually nearer, particularly in all the great epochs of the extensive and intensive enlargement of God's kingdom—all of which are presages of the *Parousia*, which is infinitely near to religious anticipation, and yet, chronologically, is indeterminably remote. All that must still precede that external *Parousia*, Paul indicates in Rom. xi. and 2 Thess. ii., and John elaborately describes in figures in the Book of Revelation.

5. The very fact that wickedness seeks the veil of night, is a witness for God's word; and as night is an image of spiritual darkness, and day is an image of spiritual and heavenly light, so are the works of night—sleep, on the one hand, and sinful nocturnal deeds on the other—images of different forms of spiritual corruption, the gross sins, which, indeed, are not only figures, but also phenomena, of spiritual corruptions. On the other hand, the putting on of the day, the armor of the day, have their spiritual meaning. The armor was a very striking figure to the Romans in particular.

6. The two great antitheses of nocturnal life: Lust and strife, pleasure and murder.

7. With the salvation of Christianity to the believer there has also broken for humanity the morning of morality, of good manners, and of true decorum.

8. The 13th verse is an imperishable reminder of Augustine's conversion (see Conf. viii. 12, 28).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 7. To every one his due! The Christian's royal motto: 1. In reference to his relation to the civil authority; 2. In his intercourse with every man.

HEUBNER: The respect which we, as Christians, owe to the civil authorities, is more than the external fulfilment of duty.

Vers 8–10. Perseverance in love. It is: 1. In respect to our neighbor a debt, which never can be paid; 2. In respect to the law, it is its fulfilment (vers. 8–10).—The debt of love toward our neighbor. 1. It is a very *great* debt; *a.* because there are so many creditors; *b.* because their demands constitute a very important total; *c.* because it can never be completely cancelled. 2. But it is nevertheless a *sweet* debt; *a.* because it is not thoughtlessly paid; *b.* because it harmonizes with God's commandment; *c.* because even the attempt to discharge it makes the heart very happy (vers. 8–10).—The debt of love is the only debt of the Christian toward his neighbor which is not only permissible, but even commanded (ver. 8).—The commandment of love toward our neighbor as the substance of all the commandments of the second table (ver. 9).—Why does love work no ill to the neighbor? 1. Because it proceeds from the root of God's eternal love for men; 2. Because it will serve God in the neighbor (ver. 10).—Love the fulfilment of the law 1. The truth of this apostolic sentiment; 2. The importance of it (ver. 10).

STARKE: The heart is known by its behavior just as the sun is by its beams (ver. 9).—Christ's garden not only produces no injurious trees, but even no useless ones (ver. 10).—HEDINGER: The eternal debt of love! Be not weary, brethren! He who loves, will be loved in return; though it be not by the thankless world, it will be by God (ver. 8).—Let no one excuse himself on the ground of ignorance; let no one say, "Who would know the many commandments and prohibitions?" The whole law is contained in the one word *love;* Micah vi. 8 (ver. 9).

SPENER: There is one debt which we all owe—*to love one another;* that is such a debt, that, if we should daily count it up, it would always remain just as great as it had been (ver. 8).—Though a thing may sometimes appear to be forbidden, if love requires it, it is not forbidden, but rather commanded: on the other hand, sometimes something may appear to be commanded, but if it is in conflict with love, it is not commanded (ver. 10).

GERLACH: The debt of love is never wholly payable; its fulfilment increases the demands made upon it, for it makes love warmer (ver. 8).

LISCO: The believer's holy love fulfils its obligations even toward every body without exception (vers. 8–10).—The *one* requirement of love is divided into two chief commandments, in Matt. xxii. 37–40.—HEUBNER: The magnitude of the commandment of love (vers. 8–10).—The harmonizing of the Divine *should* and the human *would* can only take place by love; by it, compulsion is transformed into freedom (ver. 9).—Every wicked thing is invariably an unkindness (ver. 10).

BESSER: He who shows love to another in order to get clear of him, has not love (ver. 8).

SCHWEIZER: Love, the fulfilment of the law, or, love performs what the law cannot obtain. The law does not deliver us: 1. Because it is a multiplicity of commandments and prohibitions, which perplex us; 2. Because it pronounces a curse on every one who transgresses a single point; 3. Because it is presented to us as an external power issuing its commands to us; 4. Because it takes refuge in threats and promises. Christian love is the contrary of all this.

Vers. 8–10. THE PERICOPE *for the Fourth Sunday after Epiphany.*—THYM: The royal law of love toward our neighbor: 1. Its great necessity; 2. Its inward nature; 3. Its indescribable blessing.—HARLESS: Love is the fulfilment of the law. 1. The law, *a.* which makes love for us an indebtedness; *b.* and therefore proves it to be our debt. 2. Love, *a.* which knows no indebtedness except to love; *b.* and therefore does not come from the law, but from faith.—HEUBNER: The simplicity of Christian virtue: 1. It proceeds from *one* spirit of humility and love; 2. All its effects harmonize in one—the manifestation of love.

Vers. 11–14. The decided breach of believing Christians with darkness: 1. Wherefore should we break off from it? *a.* because it is time to do it; *b.* because it is high time. 2. In what should this breach consist? *a.* in laying off the works of darkness; *α.* gross, sensual sins; *β.* subtle, inward sins; *b.* in putting on the armor of light; *α.* in walking honestly as in the day; *β.* in putting on the Lord

Jesus Christ (or, α. civil righteousness; β. righteousness of faith).

LUTHER: Do not torture the body excessively by the intolerable holiness of watching, fasting, and freezing, as the hypocrites do (ver. 14).

STARKE: I must show outwardly what I am inwardly. Those who are inwardly good, must also have a good form and color (ver. 13).—QUESNEL: Time passes by, and eternity presses on (ver. 11).—MÜLLER: There is many a thing and idea comprised in putting on Christ; our Christianity is not a stagnant existence, but a growth; it is no leap, but a walk (ver. 12).—The armor of light well becomes a Christian. We must either clothe ourselves with darkness or with light (ver. 12).

SPENER: Let us put on the Lord Jesus Christ. But we put Him on *once* by the belief that we receive, as our possession, His righteousness and merit, which He has imparted to us, and that we shall appear in them alone, before God's throne. We *afterward* put Him on also by godly imitation, in walking as Christ has walked (ver. 14).

LISCO: The one care for the body, in bestowing upon it what is necessary, is natural; the other is sinful, when the lusts and desires of the body are provided for (ver. 14).

HEUBNER: Christian watchfulness (vers. 11–14). Christian knowledge of the time. The time of Christianity is a time of salvation (ver. 11).—There are many awakening voices: Public services—preachers—every stroke of the bell—the Bible (ver. 11).—The Christian is not a night-walker, a nocturnal rioter, but a walker by day (ver. 13).—Temperance, chastity, love—three great prime virtues (ver. 13).—SCHWEIZER: Blissful joy at the Reformation as a rising light (Sermon on the Anniversary Day of the Reformation).

Vers. 11–14. THE PERICOPE *for the First Sunday of Advent.*—HEUBNER: The call of Christianity is a call to awake from spiritual sleep.—The appeal of Christian watchmen: 1. It is day; the sun is risen! 2. Awake, arise! 3. Be purified to new life! 4. Put on Christ!—NAGEL: The awakening voice with which the Church appeals to us on its holydays, tells us: 1. What time it is; 2. What it is high time to do.—KAPFF: The advent message: 1. As a message of salvation and joy; 2. As a message for penitence and renewal.—FLOREY: The advent season is a holy morning-time of the heart and life.—HARLESS: The festal ornament well-pleasing to Christ: 1. A watchful eye, to see the night that covers the earth; 2. An enlightened eye, to behold the day which has come; 3. A willing heart, to do what the day requires.—PETRI: What time is it for us? 1. To arise from sleep; 2. To put on the armor of light.—RAUTENBERG: What belongs to rising from sleep? 1. To open the eyes aright; 2. To put on the right garment; 3. To take up the right armor.—THYM: Paul's vigorous advent preaching: 1. On the advent time; 2. On the advent duties; 3. On the advent blessing.

[FARINDON, on ver. 14: Look into Christ's wardrobe, and you will find no torn or ragged apparel. Christ had the robe of righteousness, the garment of innocency, the spotless coat of temperance and chastity, and with these He went about doing good. Out of this wardrobe we must make up our wedding garment. We must be conformable to Christ. In the *rule* of our obedience, we must not wear a garment of our own fancying, an irregular, an unprescribed devotion; in the *ends* of it, we must glorify God on the earth; and in the *parts* of it, we must not have a parcel-garment. This garment must fit every part, and be universal.

[LEIGHTON: He that truly loves his neighbor as himself, will be as loth to wrong him as to wrong himself, either in that honor and respect that is due to him, or in his life, or chastity, or goods, or good name, or to lodge so much as an unjust desire or thought, because that is the beginning and conception of real injury. In a word, the great disorder and crookedness of the corrupt heart of man consists in self-love; it is the very root of all sin both against God and man; for no man commits any offence, but it is in some way to profit or please himself. It was a high enormity of self-love that brought forth the very first sin of mankind. That was the bait which took, more than either the color or the taste of the apple—that it was desirable for knowledge.

[JOHN HOWE, on ver. 10: Would it not make a happy world, if we all so loved our neighbor: 1. That we would no more hurt him than we would ourselves; 2. Would no more cheat him than we would ourselves; 3. No more oppress and crush him than we would ourselves.—What a spring of mischief and misery in the world would be shut up, dried up, if that proneness to hard, harsh, and frequently unjust thoughts, were, by the workings of such a spirit of love, erased out of the minds and hearts of men!

[BURKITT, on ver. 14: This implies: 1. That the soul of man, since the fall, is in a naked state, destitute of those divine graces of the Holy Spirit which were its original clothing in the day of undefiled innocency; 2. That Jesus Christ is our spiritual clothing; *a.* in His righteousness, to pardon and justify us, He is our clothing, to cover the guilt of sin out of God's sight; *b.* In His grace, to sanctify us, by which He cleanses us from our sins, pollution, and filthiness; *c.* that Jesus Christ, in order to our spiritual clothing, must be put on by faith: an unapplied Christ justifies none, saves none. It was not sufficient, under the law, that the blood of the sacrifice was shed, but it was also to be sprinkled, in order to the expiation of guilt.

[DODDRIDGE, on ver. 14: By putting on the Lord Jesus: 1. We make the gospel day yet brighter in the eyes of all around us; 2. We anticipate, while here in this world of comparative darkness, the lustre with which we hope, through Christ's influence and grace, to shine forth in the celestial kingdom of our Father.

[JOHN WESLEY: The whole law under which we now are, is fulfilled by love. Faith, working or animated by love, is all that God now requires of man. He has substituted, not sincerity, but love, for angelic perfection.—Very excellent things are spoken of love—it is the essence, the spirit, the life of all virtue. It is not only the first and great command, but *all* the commands in one.

[RICHARD WATSON, *Sermon on the Armor of Light* (ver. 12): I. What the armor of light is, with which the Apostle exhorts us to invest ourselves. II. Why it has the appellation of "armor of light:" (1.) Because of its heavenly origin; (2.) Because it is only found where Christianity exists and exerts its proper influence; (3.) Because it corresponds to the character of our dispensation, which is a dispensation of light. III. The motives which should induce us, in compliance with the exhortation, to array ourselves with it: (1.) From a

consideration of the degraded state of man, who is not invested with this armor; (2.) The moral elevation which this armor gives to every one who is invested with it; (3.) We must either conquer or be conquered.

[HODGE, on ver. 14: All Christian duty is included in putting on the Lord Jesus; in being like Him, having that similarity of temper and conduct which results from being intimately united to Him by the Holy Spirit.—J. F. H.]

FIFTH SECTION.—*The true practice of the living worship of God in the management and adjustment of differences between the scrupulous and weak (the captives under the law), and the strong (those inclined to laxity and freedom). The Christian universalism of social life* (TO TAKE NO OFFENCE, TO GIVE NO OFFENCE).

CHAP. XIV. 1-XV. 4.

A. Reciprocal regard, forbearance, and recognition, between the weak and the strong; of taking offence and judging. Chap. xiv. 1-13.
B. Of giving offence and despising. Chap. xiv. 13-xv. 1.
C. Reciprocal edification by self-denial, after the example of Christ. Chap. xv. 2-4

A. Chap. xiv. 1-13.

1 Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, *but* not to doubtful disputations
2 [judgments of thoughts].[1] For one believeth that he may eat all things:
3 another, [but he] who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth [*or*, the
eater] despise him that eateth not [*or*, the abstainer]; and let not him which
eateth not [*or*, the abstainer][2] judge him that eateth [*or*, the eater]: for God
4 hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his
own master he standeth or falleth; yea, he shall be holden up [made to stand]:
5 for God [the Lord][3] is able[4] to make him stand. One man esteemeth one day
above another: another esteemeth every day *alike*. Let every man be fully
6 persuaded in his own mind. He that [who] regardeth the day, regardeth *it*
unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not
regard *it* [*omit this clause*].[5] He that [And[6] he who] eateth, eateth to the Lord,
for he giveth God thanks [thanks unto God]; and he that [who] eateth not, to
7 the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks [thanks unto God]. For none
8 of us liveth to himself, and no man [none] dieth to himself. For whether we
live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die[7] unto the Lord:
9 whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ
both died, and rose, and revived [Christ died and lived *again*],[8] that he might
10 be Lord both of the dead and [the] living. But why dost thou judge thy
brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand
11 before the judgment-seat of Christ [God].[9] For it is written,[10] *As* I live, saith
the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess [give
12 praise] to God. So then every one of us shall give[11] account of himself to
13 God. Let us not therefore judge one another any more:

B. Chap. xiv. 13-xv. 1.

13 But judge this rather, that no man [not to] put a stumbling-block or an
14 occasion to fall [of falling] in *his* [a] brother's way. I know, and am per
suaded by [in] the Lord Jesus, that *there is* nothing [that nothing is] unclean
of itself:[12] but to him that esteemeth any thing to be [accounteth any thing]
15 unclean, to him *it is* unclean. But [For][13] if thy brother be grieved with *thy*
meat [if because of thy meat thy brother is grieved], now walkest thou not
charitably [thou art no longer walking according to love]. Destroy not him
16 with thy meat, [Destroy not by thy meat him] for whom Christ died. Let not
17 then your[14] good be evil spoken of: For the kingdom of God is not meat and
drink [eating and drinking]; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy

18 Ghost. For he that [who] in these things [herein][16] serveth Christ *is* accept-
19 able [well-pleasing] to God, and approved of men. Let us therefore follow[1]
after the things which make for peace [the things of peace], and things where-
with one may edify another [the things which pertain to mutual edification].
20 For meat destroy not the work of God. All things indeed *are* pure [clean];
21 but *it is* evil for that [the] man who eateth with [through] offence. *It is* good
neither [not] to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor [*to do*] *any thing* whereby
[wherein] thy brother stumbleth, or is offended,[17] or is made [*omit* made] weak.
22 Hast thou faith?[18] have *it* to thyself before God. Happy [Blessed] *is* he that
condemneth [who judgeth] not himself in that thing [*omit* thing] which he
23 alloweth. And [But] he that [who] doubteth is damned [condemned] if he
eat, because *he eateth* [it is] not of faith: for [and] whatsoever *is* not of faith
is sin.

Chap. xv. 1 We then [Now we who] that are strong ought to bear the infirmities
of the weak, and not to please ourselves.

C. Chap. xv. 2-4.

2 Let[19] every one of us[20] please *his* neighbour for *his* good [with a view] to
3 edification. For even Christ pleased not himself; but, as it is written,[21] The
4 reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me. For whatsoever things
were written aforetime were written[22] for our learning [instruction], that we
through [the][23] patience and [the] comfort of the Scriptures might have [our]
hope.

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 1.—[The literal rendering is given above. For further explanations, see the *Exeg. Notes.*

[2] Ver. 3.—[*Rec.* (with D³. L., Vulgate): καὶ ὁ μή. ℵ¹. A. B. C. D¹. (most modern editors): ὁ δὲ μή. Meyer and Philippi, however, consider the latter a mechanical repetition from ver. 2.—The emendations suggested above are from Alford. They avoid the diffuseness of the E. V., but would scarcely be admissible in a revision. *Eater, non-eater*, would be more exact.

[3] Ver. 4.—[*Rec.*, C³. D. F. L., Chrysostom, Theodoret, read Θεός. ℵ. A. B. C¹., early versions: κύριος. The latter is adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Tregelles, Lange; the former by Philippi, Meyer, De Wette, Wordsworth. The Θεός might have been borrowed from ver. 2, as a correction; or the κύριος may have been a gloss derived from τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ. The probabilities are so equally balanced, that the MS. authority must decide in favor of κύριος.

[4] Ver. 4.—[*Rec.*, (L.): δυνατὸς γάρ ἐστιν; a few authorities: δυνατὸς γάρ; ℵ. A. B. C. D. F.: δυνατεῖ γάρ. The last is accepted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, De Wette, Alford, Tregelles, Lange. Fritzsche, Philippi: δυνατὸς γάρ.

[5] Ver. 6—The clause: καὶ ὁ μὴ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν, κυρίῳ οὐ φρονεῖ, is omitted in ℵ. B. C¹. D. F., Vulgate, Coptic, by Augustine, Jerome, Rufinus, Pelagius, Hilary, Mill, Lachmann, Meyer, Tregelles (in the versions of the Amer. Bible Union and of Five Ang. Clergymen). It is found in (*Rec.*) C³. L., Peshito, in Chrysostom and Theodoret; retained by Reiche, De Wette, Fritzsche, Philippi, Stuart, Wordsworth, Lange. Tischendorf varies in his different editions; Alford brackets it. The usual explanation of those who retain it is, that the omission was occasioned by the similar ending (φρονεῖ) in both clauses having misled some of the early copyists. To this Dr. Lange adds: "The fear that the clause might be used to support a disregard of Christian holidays." Alford thinks it may have been omitted in the interest of the observance of the Lord's Day. His own view on this subject probably leads him to bracket the clause. The uncial authority is so strongly against it, and the want of completeness in the antitheses might so easily have led to its insertion, that there need be but little hesitation in omitting it. Dr. Hodge is silent respecting the whole matter.

[6] Ver. 6.—[The *Rec.* omits καί before ὁ ἐσθίων; but it is found in all the MSS., versions and fathers.

[7] Ver. 8.—[The transcribers have made confusion with the verb ἀποθνήσκωμεν in this verse. The best-sustained reading gives the subjunctive -ωμεν in the conditional clauses, and the indicative -ομεν after τῷ κυρίῳ. So Meyer, Alford, Tregelles.

[8] Ver. 9.—[The *Rec.* reads καὶ ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ ἀνέζησεν. This is now generally rejected, and ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἔζησεν, accepted. So Lachmann, Tischendorf, Philippi, De Wette, Meyer, Stuart, Alford, Wordsworth, Tregelles, and Lange. Many of the older critics also, though generally retaining καί before ἀπέθανεν. The following note from Meyer states the case quite fully and fairly: "The origin of all the variations can be readily explained from the reading ἀπέθανε καὶ ἔζησεν (Lachmann and Tischendorf), which is, all things considered, best sustained, and now generally accepted as original. Somewhat as follows: to ἔζησεν, ἀνέστη was added as a gloss; comp. 1 Thess. iv. 14. Then, through the acceptance of the gloss *instead* of the original word, arose the reading: ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέστη (F. G.): through the acceptance of the gloss *besides* the original word partly: ἀπέθανε κ. ἔζησε κ. ἀνέστη (Syr. Erp.), partly: ἀπέθ. κ. ἀνέστη κ. ἔζησεν (D³. L., &c.); from which latter, then, through the accidental or intentional repetition of AIV, arose the received reading (very poorly supported and spread by Erasmus). Finally, the transposition ἔζησε κ. ἀπέθ. κ. ἀνέστη (D¹. E.) was made, after ἀπέθ. κ. ἀνέστη was read, through perverted criticism; in the attempt to restore ἔζησεν, neither the spuriousness of ἀνέστη nor the proper position of ἔζησεν being known, the latter was understood of the earthly life of Jesus, and hence placed before ἀπέθανεν."

[9] Ver. 10.—[Instead of Χριστοῦ (*Rec.* ℵ³. L., many versions and fathers), Θεοῦ is found in ℵ¹. A. B. C¹. D. F. some fathers. The latter is accepted by Fritzsche, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth, Tregelles Lange; the former by the older critics, Tholuck, De Wette, Philippi. Dr. Hodge says the latter "is retained by most critical editors;" but the current of criticism now sets against it; and what was true at the date of his first edition (1835), was scarcely correct at the appearance of the edition of 1866. Χριστοῦ was probably inserted to correspond with ver. 9 (or from 2 Cor. v. 10), though it is also claimed that Θεοῦ was substituted to correspond with vers. 11, 12. Much has been said on both sides, but the MS. authority seems decisive in favor of Θεοῦ.

[10] Ver. 11.—[From the LXX., Isa. xlv. 23. Instead of ζῶ ἐγώ, the LXX. reads (at the beginning of the verse): κατ' ἐμαυτοῦ ὀμνύω. Instead of ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ Θεῷ, the LXX. (following the Hebrew): ὀμεῖται πᾶσα γλῶσσα τὸν Θεόν. The Alexandrine text of the LXX. agrees with this citation. Philippi and Meyer think this a change to conform with our verse; also, that Paul purposely varies, to express a general thought, which, however, lay at the basis of the special one expressed in the Old Testament passage.

[11] Ver. 12.—[B. D[1]. F.: ἀποδώσει; Lachmann, Tregelles. ℵ. A. C. D[3]. L.: δώσει; Philippi, Meyer, De Wette Alford brackets ἀπο. The former is more usual with λόγον, hence the latter is to be preferred. The same authorities which support δώσει, insert οὖν.

[12] Ver. 14.—[ℵ. B. C. are cited by Alford in favor of ἑαυτοῦ (*Rec.*). A. D. F. G. L. read: αυτου (to which Tregelles adds B. *Birch*). The reading of the *Rec.* is adopted by Alford, but most modern editors follow the mass of uncial authorities. The only remaining dispute is whether it should be αὑτοῦ or αὐτοῦ. The former is adopted by Griesbach, Knapp, Philippi, Tholuck, De Wette, Meyer, Lange; the latter by Lachmann, Wordsworth, Jowett, Tregelles. If Theodoret (who refers it to Christ) be cited in favor of the latter, then Chrysostom's explanation: τῇ φύσει, will support the former. Tischendorf varies (comp. his 7th ed., p. 58). See Winer, p. 143.

[13] Ver. 15.—[ℵ. A. B. C. D. F. G., Vulgate, and fathers: εἰ γάρ; adopted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tholuck, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth, Jowett, Tregelles, Lange. *Rec.* (with no uncial authorities) some versions: εἰ δέ; adopted by Philippi, Hodge, De Wette, and the older editors. Dr. Hodge, in his new edition, states the exegetical ground for the latter reading, but is hardly justified in adding: "the majority of commentators and editors retain the common text." Certainly the better supported reading is the more difficult one, hence doubly preferable on critical grounds. See the *Exeg. Notes.* Stuart says the sense seems to require γάρ, but takes no notice of the fact that it is read in the uncial MSS.

[14] Ver. 16.—[D. F., a number of versions (Vulgate, Peshito), some fathers, read: ἡμῶν. A gloss, which is useful in the interpretation of the verse. It shows that τὸ ἀγαθόν was early referred to something which was a possession of the whole Church, not of a party in the Roman Church. Comp. the *Exeg. Notes.*

[15] Ver. 18.—[*Rec.*: τούτοις, supported by ℵ[3]. D[3]. L., most cursives, many versions (Syriac, Gothic), fathers (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Tertullian); adopted by Bengel, Fritzsche, Philippi, De Wette, Meyer (in 4th ed.), Hodge, and others. The singular: τούτῳ, is found in ℵ[1]. A. B. C. D[1]. F., many versions, fathers (Origen, Rufinus, Augustine, Hilary, Pelagius, Bede); adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tholuck, Alford, Wordsworth, Jowett, Tregelles, Lange The uncial authority is overwhelmingly against the plural, which is the easier reading; hence adopted by those commentators who are more governed in their decisions by exegetical than critical grounds The later critical editors, as a rule, favor the singular. Meyer thinks it more probable that the plural was altered into the singular on account of the ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, immediately preceding, than that the singular was changed into the plural on account of the three terms of the last clause of ver. 17. But he overlooks the difficulty of the singular. The change to the plural seems far more likely.

[16] Ver. 19.—[C. D., most cursives and fathers: διώκωμεν; adopted by modern editors generally. ℵ. A. B. F. L.: διώκομεν. The vowels were readily interchanged. The indicative is *lectio difficillima;* it is taken interrogatively by Lachmann (*ed. min.*, not *maj.*), but this does not accord with the presence of ἄρα οὖν.

[17] Ver. 21.—[ℵ[1]. A. C., some versions and fathers, omit ἢ σκανδαλίζεται ἢ ἀσθενεῖ. Inserted in ℵ[3]. B. D. F. L.; retained by critical editors generally. (Lachmann, Tischendorf in later editions, Tregelles).

[18] Ver. 22.—[After πίστιν, ℵ. A. B. C. insert ἣν; adopted by Lachmann, Tregelles (no points inserted between σύ and Θεοῦ). This reading would require us to render: *The faith which thou hast, have it to thyself before God.* *Rec.* D. F. L., many versions and fathers, omit ἣν. It is rejected by Philippi, De Wette, Tholuck, Meyer, Wordsworth; bracketted by Alford. Dr. Lange thinks it was inserted so as to emphasise πίστις as something stronger than a subjective opinion. On critical grounds, the probabilities are well balanced; on exegetical grounds, the briefer reading is preferable.—The punctuation is then open to discussion. If the sentence be taken interrogatively, it should be pointed accordingly; if not, a colon should be substituted.

[19] Chap. xv. 2.—[After ἕκαστος, the *Rec.* reads γάρ, which is found in no MS.; omitted by versions, fathers, and modern editors generally.

[20] Ver. 2.—[Instead of ἡμῶν (ℵ A. B. C. D[1 3]. L.), we find ὑμῶν in D[2]. F., in the Vulgate, and a number of fathers. The first person is adopted by modern editors.

[21] Ver. 3.—[A *verbatim* citation from the LXX., Ps. lxviii. 10 (Heb. lxix. 10; Eng. lxix. 9). The LXX. is a literal rendering of the Hebrew.

[22] Ver. 4.—[The *Rec.* reads προεγράφη (the second time), with ℵ[3]. A. L., some fathers. ℵ[1]. B. C. D. F., Vulgate, Peshito, &c.: ἐγράφη; adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, De Wette, Meyer, Alford, Tregelles, Lange. B. has ἐγράφη the first time. The Amer. Bible Union omits the verb altogether; probably a typographical error, as there is no authority for it whatever.

[23] Ver. 4.—[ℵ. A. B. C. D. L., repeat διά before τῆς παρακλήσεως. Omitted in *Rec.*, D. F., versions and fathers. It is adopted by Griesbach, Bengel, Lachmann, De Wette, Alford, Wordsworth, Tregelles; rejected by Hodge, Philippi, Meyer, because the transcriber might so readily repeat it before τῆς occurring a second time. Still, the most careful editors retain it. Dr. Hodge says, in his first and last editions: "The preponderance of evidence is greatly against it;" and yet, in citing the authorities in favor of it, omits B. and ℵ., the two most important uncials, both of which had been collated carefully before his last edition appeared.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

General Preliminary Remarks.—After the Apostle has described the duties of Christians, especially of the Christians at Rome, in their various general, fundamental relations: (1.) As duties toward the Church; (2.) In all personal relations; (3.) Toward the State; and, (4.) Toward the world, he proceeds to lay down the universal deportment of the Roman Church, by establishing the proper reciprocal conduct between the strong (δυνατοί) and the weak ἀδύνατοι, chap. xv. 1; ἀσθενοῦντες, chap. xiv. 1).

In the first place, it is manifest that such a difference existed. This is especially evident from chap. xv. 7–9. Second, it is likewise evident that the one tendency springing from Judaism was a legally punctilious tendency; while the other, being connected with heathen culture and freedom, was more liberal. This is supported in a very general way by the connection of this opposition with the forms of opposition which the Apostle treats in his Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians, &c. There is the following characteristic of the antithesis as it appears here: Some are weak in regard to faith, the freedom of faith, while others are strong in this respect (chap. xiv. 21, 22). Some lay stress on their (under conditions which are not stated) eating no meat, drinking no wine (ver. 21), and keeping certain holy-days. The others know that they are free in this respect, and, proud of their freedom, and regardless of the consequence, seem inclined to use it at the expense of fellowship and unanimity. It is therefore the contrast of the *punctilious* and the *large-hearted and liberal consciences* (that is, decisions of conscience). Hence it is also characteristic of the former class, that they are inclined to judge, *to take offence;* and of the others, that they are inclined to despise, *and thus to give offence.* This contrast is so definite, that we deem it best to divide the section accordingly. Further, it follows from this that the more liberal party—we might even say the Pauline—was decidedly in the ascendancy (particularly according to chaps. xiv. 1 and xv. 1), since it was necessary to make the repeated admonition, not to break off fellowship with the others. Though the Jewish-Christian element in the Church was a numerous one, it does not follow that the element of punctilious believers was equally so.

Finally, it is absolutely necessary to distinguish the standpoint of these punctilious believers as well from the very marked (alike in degree, but in fact divided) standpoints of the Galatian and Colossian

fase teachers, as from the not less marked but yet already schismatic standpoint of the Petrine party of Corinth. The Apostle designates the Galatian false teachers, in chap. ii. 4, as *false* brethren; he conditionally excludes them from communion, in so far as they persist in their doctrinally false gospel, and would make circumcision (which is at the same time the requirement of the legal standpoint) a necessary condition of Christian salvation. By these Ebionites there can only be meant Pharisaic, purely Jewish, people.* The Colossian false teachers are, in degree, not less *false* brethren, because they likewise adulterate the ground of salvation by dogmatic confidence; but their characteristic plainly leads to the supposition of Essenic Ebionites, for their worship of angels and their asceticism indicate an infusion of heathen elements into Judaism.† There were also such *false* brethren elsewhere (2 Cor. xi. 26); and the *false* apostles in 2 Cor. xi. 13 were, undoubtedly, actually connected with the Galatian false teachers. The Petrine party itself, however, which does not seem, in the first place, to have extended beyond ethical, liturgical, and ascetic peculiarities and inclinations to separation, must be distinguished from these agitators, who furthered the doctrinal adulteration of the law.

Yet the case stood still better with the *weak* brethren in Rome. The Apostle treats them so gently, that we can evidently not take them for decidedly Ebionitic Christians, nor according to the degree and manner of the Galatian and Colossian false teachers, nor according to the initiates of Ebionitism in the Corinthian church. He forbids them only from pronouncing sentence, from their own conscientious standpoint, upon their more liberal brethren; whereas, he even takes their right of conscience against the more liberal brethren under his protection; and there is nothing said of an anathema, as in the Epistle to the Galatians, nor of a warning, as in the Epistle to the Colossians, nor of a censure, as in the Epistles to the Corinthians, to say nothing of the severe criticisms in the Pastoral Epistles. If the Apostle could have expressed such different opinions on the same Ebionitic phantom of Dr. Baur, his character itself would be to us a phantom; that is, all theology would itself have to be gradually transformed into a phantom.

By regarding the mild ‡ judgment expressed by the Apostle on the weak brethren in the Church at Rome, we are therefore aided in finding out the character of their standpoint. Various suppositions:

1. They were *Jewish Christians, who wished to retain the law*, and also the legal holy-days, sabbaths, new-moon feasts (the early commentators, Chrysostom, Ambrose, &c., Calvin, and others). Origen's rejoinder: "Meat and wine were not forbidden in the law." Tholuck observes, that Paul speaks in quite a different tone against such Judaists. The laying down of this category becomes justifiable, if we distinguish between *doctrinal* and *ethical legality* in reference to the laws on food and purification. For the reason given above, the question here cannot be concerning a *doctrinal* statute.

2. *Jewish-Christian ascetics.* For examples of them, see Tholuck, p. 699. But pure Judaism is a stranger to all strictly doctrinal forms of asceticism, and is acquainted only with an ethical form: (1.) That of the Nazarites for the whole life; (2.) That of the Nazaritic vow for a limited time; (3.) The theocratic general and special ordinance of fasts; (4.) The personal fasting of individuals in special states of life. But there can be nothing said here of all this, and just as little of the doctrinal asceticism of Christians of Essenic prejudices,* on whom the Apostle has expressed himself in Col. ii. Thus the view of Baur, and others, falls to the ground. On the abundant confusion arising from the supposition that heathen motives are connected with the motives of the weak brethren here, see Tholuck's quotations on the Neo-Platonists, the Pythagoreans, and the Gnostic Ebionites, pp. 699 ff. These do not belong here with the cited examples of Jewish Nazarites, because the latter never thought of compelling others to adopt their manner of life.

3. *Ethical and social motives*, arising from fear of mingling with the heathen sacrificial customs. Tholuck says: "According to Augustine, reference is here made to the same persons as in 1 Cor. viii., the reference here being to those who, because they, in buying food at the market, could not sufficiently distinguish the meat offered to idols, preferred to abstain altogether from eating meat. This explanation is implied by Cocceius, and has recently been defended by Michaelis, Philippi, and especially by Neander, and certainly has by far the strongest grounds in its favor." The *weak* brethren, therefore, were not influenced by doctrinal but by ethical motives: (1.) Fear of eating meat offered to idols; (2.) Of drinking the wine of the heathen drink-offerings (Deut. xxxii. 38; (3.) In addition to this was their necessity of still retaining as a pious custom the Jewish holy-days, for it is well known that the Sabbath, which was observed together with Sunday, gradually died out in the Church as a day of rest.† As examples of the abstinence named, Tho-

* [A comparison of the two Epistles will show how much more sharply defined is the defence of the liberty of the gospel in the Galatian epistle. There, the Apostle appears as a champion of our freedom; here, as a judicious guide to those whom the truth was making free. The difference in tone is a striking proof of pedagogic wisdom. —R.]

† [Comp. Lange's *Comm. Colossians*, Introd., p. 7, where the character of these false teachers is discussed. The effort to define them by means of the nomenclature of subsequent heresies has led to the greatest variety of opinions. (Even the Ebionites do not date back of the destruction of Jerusalem.) They were ascetics, undoubtedly; their views might be called Ebionitic; yet, when we recall the Phrygian character and consider the large Jewish element in that region, we see the seeds which were then just springing up, to bear fruit in the heresies so prolific in that region. Phrygian Ebionitism in the germ, is, perhaps, the best definition.—R.]

‡ [The rebuke was mild indeed then, but how pregnant its meaning as we regard it to-day. Where could one repeat more appropriately than in Rome these words: "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?" He who is strongest in the Roman Church of to-day, is "weak," according to the Apostle's judgment.—R.]

* [Meyer, and others, adopt the opinion Dr. Lange here rejects. Dr. Hodge seems to incline to this view; but he is not decided in his preference of it, for he adds: "There is nothing inconsistent with the assumption that the weak brethren here spoken of were scrupulous Jewish Christians."—R.]

† [Dean Alford (following De Wette) presents a modification of this view: "The over-scrupulous Jew *became an ascetic by compulsion*. He was afraid of pollution by eating meats sacrificed or wine poured to idols; or even by being brought into contact, in foreign countries, with casual and undiscoverable uncleanness, which in his own land he knew the articles offered for food would be sure not to have incurred. He therefore abstained from all *prepared food*, and confined himself to that which he could trace from natural growth to his own use." "All difficulty, then, is removed, by supposing that of these over-scrupulous Jews some had become converts to the gospel, and with neither the obstinacy of legal Judaisers, nor the pride of ascetics (for these are not hinted at here), but in *weakness of faith*, and the scruples of an over-tender conscience, retained their habits

luck cites Daniel (chap. i. 8, 12, 16), Esther (chap. iv. 16), Tobias (chap. i. 12), and the Maccabees (2 Macc. v. 27). The gradations (cited by Tholuck) of this scrupulousness on the part of the punctilious Jews, do not here come into consideration, as the *weak* brethren, according to Philippi's observation, did not withdraw from eating with the Gentiles (?) and the Gentile Christians. Likewise, the decree in Acts xv. is justifiably cited in favor of the view presented. Tholuck, with Philippi, is right in not admitting that, because of an adherence to special holidays, there were two parties among the *weak* brethren.

4. *Various views.* According to Erasmus, and others, both the tradition of laws respecting food and the fear of eating meat offered to idols, were motives. According to Chrysostom, and others, they would refrain from all meat, to escape blame, in consequence of the Jewish disdain of swine-meat. According to Eichhorn, these people were generally Gentile-Christian ascetics, who entertained philosophic and ascetic principles, especially the Neo-Pythagorean. Meyer supposes the "influence of Essenic principles," yet so that they are not led into conflict with justification by faith; however, he opposes Baur's view, that the people were Ebionitic Christians, because abstinence from wine by the Ebionites has been nowhere certified. He asserts, against view (3.), that the Apostle did not speak, as in 1 Cor. viii. 10, of the sacrificial character of meat and wine—as if this had been necessary in the presence of the well-known variance in the Church at Rome! After all, the object of the scrupulousness here was not the principal thing, but *the laying down of the canon by which "the weak and the strong" in a church specially called to universality have to preserve their unanimity*—the one class, by not taking offence in a Pharisaic, censorious spirit, and the other, by not giving offence in a reckless arrogance of freedom.

A. Chap. xiv. 1–18: *Reciprocal regard, forbearance, and recognition between the weak and the strong. Especially of the taking offence and judging on the part of the weak.* Meyer, on vers. 1–12: "Fraternal behavior toward the weak asked for (ver. 1). The first point of difference between the two classes, and the encouragement because of it (ver. 5). The proper point of view for both in their differences (ver. 6), and its establishment (vers. 7–9); censure and impermissibility of the opposite course of conduct (vers. 10–12)."

Ver. 1. **Him that is weak in the faith** [τὸν δὲ ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει]. The δέ connects with the foregoing; chap. xiii. 14. After the Apostle has expressed the recognition of physical necessities, and the necessity of limiting the provision for them, he finds himself induced, first of all, to admonish those more freely disposed in this respect to be forbearing toward the weak (Meyer, Philippi). This applies to the formal connection;* but, according to the real connection, he must come, at any rate, to this difference between Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity (De Wette), although only the first elements of it were present in the Roman Church.

Weak in the faith. The feeble in respect to faith, the standpoint of faith and its consequences. Since each party reciprocally held the other as the weaker in faith, we might think that in this sense the general exhortation applies to both parts in the sense of: him who appears to you as weak in the faith. But Paul does not deny his standpoint; he immediately afterward calls one who is scrupulous respecting food: ὁ ἀσθενῶν. And this is important; it proves that the Apostle does not design to deprive the strong of the liberty, which he himself takes, of frankly expressing his judgment on the differences. The strong should therefore stand to their conviction; but they should not make any such application of it as would be against brotherly love and fellowship. According to Tholuck, his reason for addressing the strong first (yet not "altogether," though "chiefly") was, not that the Gentile Christians constituted the great majority of the Church, but, on the principle stated by Chrysostom, that the weaker part stands in continual need of most care. Yet the Christians of Pauline tendencies, who must not be identified strictly with Gentile Christians, constitute the body of the Church.

As the two parties were not at all separated, the προςλαμβάνεσθε cannot mean exactly *receive;* at least not in the sense of strict communion (Erasmus, Grotius, Luther, and others), nor *receive him to yourselves* (Olshausen [Hodge, Stuart], and others), according to Acts xxviii. 2. Between these there lies the idea of reception in the emphatic sense, to draw into an inward, friendly intercourse. [Alford: "'*Give him your hand*,' as Syr. (Tholuck): 'count him one of you,' opposed to rejecting or discouraging him."—R.] In such relations of difference, the relative danger of intolerance always lies on the stronger side; therefore the case was very different in Rome from what it was in Galatia. Yet the Apostle does not fail to point out the intolerance on the part of those who are punctilious.—Explanations of the πίστις:

1. The *religious belief* of the ecclesiastical doctrine (Origen, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, Beza; Luther: the Lutheran theologians in part).

2. *Moral conviction* in reference to what is permissible (Este, Bellarmine, Erasmus, some of the older Protestant theologians, Arminians, Socinians). [So Stuart, Hodge.]

3. Accommodating explanations: The practical application of faith (Chrysostom, and others); knowledge (Grotius, Semler).

Against (1.) it must be said (apart from the fact that a difference still exists between the doctrine of faith, as such, and the vital energy of justifying faith), that the Apostle does not here emphasize the antithesis of truth and error, but that of confidence and doubt. Against (2.) it may be said, that the reference cannot be, absolutely, to a merely subjective ideal fidelity to conviction without the objective basis of truth. It is clear from ver. 6, that the Apostle ascribes to both parties religious faith as well as fidelity to conviction; that the weaker brother holds, in a certain sense, most inflexibly to his conviction, follows from the fact that he is of the party that judges, while the other is of the party that despises. Ver. 23 says, that he can even sin against his faith by eating in doubt; and the context says, as well, that the less careful brother can

of abstinence and observation of days." But in a Church which was metropolitan, and hence cosmopolitan, other peculiarities might sharpen the distinction between the weak and the strong. Such divisions are the result of temperament, as well as of nationality and education.—R.]

* [If the purely prohibitory sense of chap. xiii. 14 be accepted, the formal connection is with the general exhortations of chap. xiii. Δέ has, then, a specifying force, though it is, perhaps, at the same time, slightly contrastive (so Alford).—R.]

sin against his faith by an uncharitable abuse of his freedom. Thus both parties have and exercise faith, being true to their conviction of faith; but the weak in faith show their weakness by not venturing, in the traditional scrupulousness of their legal conscience, to draw the full conclusion from their justifying faith, in order to break through their religious prejudices and prepossessions.

The Apostle proves that he does not recognize this weakness as a permanent rule for their life, by the candidly expressed conviction of his standpoint, as well as by his doctrine, in ver. 14; but he does not wish that the free development of their consistency of faith should be affected by the strong giving them offence, either to make them more scrupulous, or to mislead to a frivolous transgression of their conscientious limits. As, therefore, faith in 1 Cor. xii. 9 is a vigorous faith in reference to performing miracles, so here, in reference to the practical development of life; in both cases there is the full consequence of world-conquering confidence—there, in overcoming the force of the disturbed states of body and soul, and here, in conquering the power of legal misconceptions and prejudices. Tholuck is correct in observing, that the two explanations (of religious faith and fidelity to conviction) do not conflict with each other. The religious Christian faith, according to its practical form in the developing stage of the dictate of conscience, comprises both elements; as even the early expositors, who explained πίστις by saving faith, have generally placed the *certitudo conscientiæ* along with it (see Tholuck, p. 705); while, on the other hand, it is made emphatic in many ways, that reference here is to the moral conviction of those who believe in Christ on the ground of this faith (Meyer). [Philippi, Tholuck, Meyer, and most German commentators, together with Alford, and others, have carefully guarded against the purely subjective meaning: *moral conviction*, adopted by Stuart and Hodge. At the same time, they very properly reject the purely objective sense of πίστις, *Christian doctrine*—a sense which the word rarely, if ever, has in the New Testament. Hence the correct rendering is not: *weak in faith*, or as to faith (Hodge), for thus the article is ignored, nor yet: *weak in his faith*, which is too subjective, but (as in E. V.): *weak in the faith*. Alford: "Holding **the faith** imperfectly—*i. e.*, not being able to receive the faith in its strength, so as to be above such prejudices."—R.]

But not to judgments of thoughts [μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν. Dr. Lange: *Doch nicht zur Aburtheilung von Beweggründen*. See below.—R.] Διάκρισις means, in 1 Cor. xii. 10 and Heb. v. 14, to pronounce judgment, sentence. Διαλογισμοί generally denotes thoughts, but, regarded as moral (or often immoral) motives, imaginations (Rom. i. 21; 1 Cor. iii. 20), or even doubts (Phil. ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 8). Accordingly, the connection leads to the explanation: *Not to the judicial decision of motives*. Do not keep frequent company with them for the *object*, or even to such an issue of the matter, that the mutual motives or differences shall be concluded by premature decision, that a fault-finding of the different tendencies can arise from it. It is evident that the expression cannot mean: "Not for criticizing scrupulous niceties," as an exhortation to the strong (Tholuck).* For the Apostle himself has criticized the scrupulous niceties of the weak sufficiently plainly, by characterizing them as weak, and not yielding their point theoretically. Philippi is right when he observes that, throughout the present chapter, the Apostle ascribes the κρίνειν to the *weak*, but the ἐξουθενεῖν to the strong. Yet he arrives at the explanation: Receive them affectionately, so that no mental doubts arise in them. But this is something quite different from Luther's expression: Do not perplex their consciences. Mental doubts must needs arise in them, and even be awakened, if one would aid them to a more liberal standpoint. But, in their theoretical treatment, they must not be forced beyond the measure of their weakness, *but such a premature decision should not also arise on their side*. Paul could well exact of the strong, that they should not eat meat for the sake of the weak, &c.; but not, that they should hypocritically deny their more liberal view in mental intercourse with them, or allow it to be overcome and judged. This submission of many a more discerning one to the harsh judgment of the narrow-minded has ever been a source of serious injury. But the measure of possibility should be, to treat the differences as non-essential peculiarities, on the common ground of being the measure of a truly hearty, but also very careful, intercourse (comp. chap. xvi. 17, 18). This premature decision of what the development of spiritual life can harmonize only in time, is therefore forbidden to both parties. The strong are, however, chiefly recommended to deport themselves according to their difficult task, just because the others are chiefly inclined to judge. This view becomes still stronger, if εἰς be taken in the sense of result.

If we distinguish candidly the two views: 1. Receive them, but not so that a reciprocal mental judgment is the result of it; 2. Receive them, but not to pronounce judgment on their scruples (Grotius, and others), we must urge against (2.), that the stress lies on the modality, on the manner in which the strong should be accustomed to cultivate intercourse with the weak.* Therefore Reiche is right in referring the prohibition to both parties, and Chrysostom was not incorrect in attributing criticizing to the weak. That διάκρισις may also mean doubt (Theophylact), does not come further into consideration. Erasmus, Beza, Er. Schmid, have accepted the classical meaning of "doubt" for διαλογισμοί, and "conflict" for διάκρισις. [So E. V.] Therefore disputations. But these have ever been unavoidable, and even Paul has not avoided them.

Ver. 2. **For one believeth,** &c. [ὃς μὲν πιστεύει, κ.τ.λ.] The explanation: He is convinced that he can eat every thing (πιστεύει φαγεῖν; Tholuck, Reiche, and others), makes faith a subjective opinion. But it rather means: He has a confidence of faith, according to which he can eat every thing (ὥστε φαγεῖν πάντα; Fritzsche, Meyer, Philippi).

But he who is weak [ὁ δὲ ἀσθενῶν.

* [So Alford: "In order to settle the points on which he has scruples" Hodge: "Not presuming to sit in judgment on the opinions of your brethren."—R.]

* [Fritzsche, Tholuck, Meyer, De Wette, Alford, and most, apply this added clause (*caution*; Meyer) of the exhortation to the strong alone. Notwithstanding Dr. Lange's objection, it seems the preferable view; for certainly the first part of the verse is addressed to the strong exclusively, and the διάκρισις, which means "power of distinguishing between" (Alford), is more applicable to them. Besides, in ver. 4 the exhortation comes in turn to the weak, &c. The word διαλογισμῶν means *thoughts*, generally *in malam partem*, in the New Testament. It is referred by the authors above named to the scrupulous thoughts cherished by the weak. The idea of doubt enters only in connection with this reference.—R.]

The E. V. assumes a strict antithesis here, but the τὸν ἀσθενοῦντα (ver. 1) is resumed; hence it is not necessary to find any other special reason for the anacoluthon, though another may be allowable.—R.] The Apostle does not continue with ὃς δέ, because he will first take the weak into special consideration. —**Eateth herbs.** *Λάχανα.* The expression is pressed by Meyer, but something symbolical or hyperbolical will nevertheless have to be allowed to his explanation; for example, the joint designation of bread, of vegetable food in general.* And it would follow from his view, that this eating of vegetables is an essential characteristic of the weak one, which can be urged with as little literalness as that the strong one is addicted to the eating of all kinds of food. His characteristic is the eating of meat, free from all ordinances. Therefore Fritzsche, Philippi, and others, would not regard the expression as an unconditional preclusion from all enjoyment of meat, as Meyer does. Philippi: "Some would only absolutely refrain from eating meat in order the more easily to overcome temptation in special cases, and others only in those special cases, particularly in the social meals, where their conduct was marked in the church as surprising; and, finally, others would only do so at the social meals, where they were certain that the meat placed before them was meat offered to idols, or, at any rate, were uncertain whether or not it was meat offered to idols. But all these could be very well designated as λαχανοφάγοι."

Ver. 3. **Let not him who eateth despise,** &c. The ἐξουθενεῖν is the specifically improper conduct of him who, occupying a more liberal point of view, in his own wisdom pleases himself (Tholuck: "The conceit of illuminism, which was found even among the Gentile Christians, as 1 Cor. viii.").—**Judge.** On the other hand, the κρίνειν is the specifically improper conduct of the legal believer, and it is not correct to suppose that (according to Tholuck) the ἐξουθενεῖν belongs as a species under this κρίνειν. That the Apostle, in the present section, has, first of all, to do with the one judging, the one taking offence, is plain, as well from the construction of the foregoing verse as from the succeeding fourth verse. It is also clear from the additional:

For God hath received him [ὁ Θεὸς γὰρ αὐτὸν προσελάβετο]. He has been received into the communion of God and Christ, and thou wilt excommunicate him? This should always be perceived by believers relying on the letter, in relation to Christians who are established upon the real ground of faith. [Stuart and Hodge (following Calvin) apply this clause to both classes, but this is forbidden both by the context and by the fact that the strong are not disposed to *reject* but to *despise* the weak; while the weak are ever for excommunicating the strong, withdrawing from fellowship, &c. Hence the pertinence of the clause to this class. So Meyer, De Wette, Philippi, Alford, and most.—R.] The mark of this reception is rather the peace and light of fellowship with God, than reception into the Church. Yet this also comprises the fact, that God has received him into His service as a servant (Vatabl.), but only indirectly.

Ver. 4. **Who art thou?** &c. [σὺ τίς εἶ, κ.τ.λ. Comp. chap. ix. 20.] Tholuck is here quite beyond the connection (in consequence of the supposition that ἐξουθενεῖν is only a species of κρίνειν), when he questions whether the weak one here judging is addressed. The σύ is claimed to belong to both parts (also according to Reiche and Chrysostom) [Stuart, Hodge]; while Meyer and Philippi, on the contrary, properly find in it an address to the weak one judging.

Another man's servant [ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην. Paul uses οἰκέτης only here, and it occurs in the New Testament but rarely (Luke xvi. 13; Acts x. 7; 1 Peter ii. 18). It means a *house-servant*, who is more closely connected with the family than the other slaves (Meyer).—R.] We must not pass lightly over the ἀλλότριον. It means not merely *another*, but a *strange* one. Meyer, and others: "He who is not in *thy* service, but in the service of *another*. But the one who judges is also in the service of this other one. That which causes him to judge, is not chiefly the notion that he is the master of this servant, but that the servant conducts himself in his service as an ἀλλότριος, who has in him much that is in itself surprising. The weak one fails to find in him the manner of the οἰκεῖος.

To his own master [τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ]. The κύριος is still chiefly figurative, the master of the strange servant. In order to understand the thought to its fullest extent, we must first consider the figure. It is the figure of a master who takes many kinds of servants in his service. Now, if he has one from a foreign country who makes himself a surprising exception, the matter belongs to the master alone, who has become "his own master"—that is, the exclusive master.

Standeth or falleth [στήκει ἢ πίπτει]. The standing and falling, as an expression of God's judgment (Ps. i. 5; Luke xxi. 36, &c.), has therefore also the further figurative meaning of standing or not standing in the household judgment. But this figure is from the beginning a clear designation of the relation in which Jewish and Gentile Christians stand to Christ. Christ is the Master; see vers. 8, 9; comp. 1 Cor. vi. 20; 1 Peter ii. 9. The dative may be regarded as *dativ. comm.*, even if the master himself is the judge, because it is his loss or gain if the servant falls or stands. Explanations:

1. The standing or falling is judicially understood as God's judgment (Calvin, Grotius, and many others).

2. The continuance or non-continuance in true Christian life is meant (Vatabl., Semler, De Wette, Maier, Meyer).

The opposition of these two views has no well-justified meaning, since, in a religious sense, God's judgment is executed through the life.* Meyer, indeed, says, in favor of (2.): "To make stand in the judgment (to absolve), is not the work of Divine power, but of grace." But besides the fact that power and grace do not lie so far asunder, there comes into consideration the further fact, that the question here is not concerning a making to stand chiefly in God's judgment, but in the uninvited judgment of men (Ebionitism, hierarchism, &c.).

He shall be made to stand [σταθήσεται

† That he does not mention *bread*, but *vegetables*, can be of service in the exegesis. Even bread first passed through the hands of many people; he could more easily have vegetables from the first hand. In this sense it was the shibboleth of the weak one. Therefore his motive was the careful avoidance of contamination from fellowship with the heathen.

* [If, however, the *judgment* be confined to the final and future one, there is an opposition, and (1.) must be rejected. Alford: "Remains in the place and estimation of a Christian, from which those would eject him." This is simplest and best.—R.]

δέ]. Here the Apostle completely withdraws the figurative veil from the thought. The strong man will remain standing in his freedom of faith.*

For the Lord is able to make him stand [δυνατεῖ γὰρ ὁ κύριος στῆσαι αὐτόν. See *Textual Notes* [3] and [4].—R.] Christ supports the believer. If the reading κύριος were regarded as an exegetical correction, we would have to consider, in the reading Θεός, the universal historical, spiritual, and external protection which God has bestowed upon the more liberal heathen Christianity, in opposition to the narrow Jewish Christianity, and to the pure religion of faith in opposition to legally weakened faith. Meyer: "He does not say it as one who *gives security*, but who *hopes*." This is against Reiche, who says that Paul could not go security for the perseverance for the strong one in faith, with his liberal views, and hence the reference must be to the being supported in the judgment.† Grotius says, better: *est bene ominantis*. It must be observed, that the Apostle speaks of the future of the strong man *in genere*, but not of that of each individual, for he had early experienced that individual men, reputed to be strong, lapsed into antinomianism.

Ver. 5. **One man esteemeth one day above another** [ὃς μὲν κρίνει ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν]. He distinguishes one day from another, and selects it as a holy-day. *Κρίνειν* = *probare*. The second point of difference. Selections for feast-days, and not for fast-days, are spoken of (Chrysostom, Augustine, Fritzsche). In harmony with the explanation of fast-days, ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν has also been explained by *alternis diebus* (the Vulgate: *judicat diem inter diem;* Bengel: the appointment of days for distributing alms). [It has also been referred to the usage in regard to abstinence from meat, &c.—R.] Tholuck: "As from the commandments on food, so also from the Jewish holy-days (Col. ii. 16), particularly the Sabbath, the Jewish Christian could not wean himself, for we find the observance of the Sabbath even in the fifth century of the Church, also in *Const. Ap.* 25." The same author correctly observes, that the holy-days, among the Jews, were not just the same as fast-days (see also Gal. iv. 10).‡

Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind [ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοΐ πληροφορείσθω]. The Apostle does not decide in a dogmatical way, although he has sufficiently indicated his point of view. But he lays down a rule which infallibly leads to reconciliation. We cannot here translate νοῦς: in his *disposition* (De Wette), for every one of both these parties would be thus assured in disposition. Rather, every one should seek to change his conviction of feeling—as it is connected with faith in authority, party influence, &c.—into his inmost, spiritually effected conviction. We could therefore here translate νοῦς: in his *understanding*, his self-reflection, his practical reason, his mediated self-consciousness; the same thought is comprised in the expression: self-understanding, regarded as the conscious and reflecting spiritual life, by which the νοῦς constitutes an antithesis to the immediateness of the πνεῦμα (see 1 Cor. xiv. 14, 15). In this tendency the rationalist must become free from the dogma of deistical or pantheistical illuminism, and arrive at true rationality; in this tendency, the one who is bound to ordinances must learn to distinguish between the law of the Spirit and the law of the letter; in this tendency, both parties must become free from prejudice, fanaticism, and phraseology, so as to know how to be tolerant, and then to be in peace.*

Ver. 6. **He who regardeth the day** [ὁ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν]. This verse is a guiding-star, according to which every one, in his spiritual life, should become certain in his conviction. The more one seeks to sanctify his opinion religiously, to bring it before the Lord, and to change it to thanksgiving, so much the more must he distinguish the true and the false in the light of God.

Regardeth it unto the Lord [κυρίῳ φρονεῖ. The dative is *dat. commodi*.] The κύριος is Christ (Meyer, Philippi, and others); referred by many to God, against which is ver. 9; Meyer: unto the Lord's service. Yet, at all events, a service in a wider sense is meant: for the honor of his Lord (see 1 Cor. x. 31).—[**And he that regardeth not,** &c. See *Textual Note* [5].—R.]

Proof: **For he giveth thanks unto God**

* [Dr. Hodge, who applies ver. 3 to both weak and strong, although admitting that the admonition is chiefly addressed to the weak, in his comments on this verse, makes a special application about treating the weak in faith with forbearance. This is altogether contrary to the context.—R.]

† [Alford thinks this clause is inapplicable, if standing and falling at the great day are meant. He adds: "Notice, this argument is entirely directed *to* the *weak*, who uncharitably judges the *strong;* not *vice-versâ*. The *weak* imagines that the *strong* cannot be a true servant of God, nor retain his steadfastness amidst such temptation. To this the Apostle answers: (1) That *such judgment belongs only to Christ, whose servant he is;* (2.) That *the Lord's almighty power is able to keep him up, and will do so.*" That this expression is not to be taken as absolutely true of individuals, is evident; yet it must not be made too general.—R.]

‡ [Dean Alford argues from this verse against the recognition of the Divine obligation of one day in seven by the Apostle. "The obvious inference from his strain of arguing is, that he knew of no such obligation, but believed all times and days to be, to the Christian strong in faith, ALIKE." "It must be carefully remembered, that this inference does not concern the question of the observance of *the Lord's Day* as *an institution of the Christian Church, analogous to* the ancient Sabbath, binding on us from considerations of *humanity* and *religious expediency*, and *by the rules of that branch of the Church in which Providence has placed us*, but not in any way inheriting the Divinely-appointed obligation of the other, or the strict prohibitions by which its sanctity was defended." But the presence of the fourth commandment in the Decalogue, the recognition (and explanation) of the obligation to keep the Sabbath by our Lord, as well as a true conception of the relation of the Law to the Christian Dispensation, is against this sweeping view. To make of the Lord's Day a merely ecclesiastical institution, is to deprive it of all sanctity under a free government. Alford, too, assumes that there is a difference of opinion implied here, respecting the observance of the Lord's Day, and infers then, from the language of ver. 6, that the Apostle could not have recognised the obligation, or he would not have commended the man who did not regard the day. But there is no hint anywhere of a difference of opinion in regard to the observance of the Lord's Day, though we may admit that such observance was not yet universal; besides, the text of ver. 6 is disputed. Comp. Lange's *Comm. Matthew*, vii. 8, p. 217; *Galatians*, iv. 10, pp. 106, 109; *Colossians*, ii. 16, pp. 53, 58; Haldane, *Romans*, pp. 688–721.—Also the literature of the Sabbath question, as published by the N. Y. Sabbath Committee.—R.]

* [The use of νοῦς, not πνεῦμα, shows that reflection, judgment, and all the proper exercises of the practical reason, are called for in the decision of questions of personal duty. It is not the intuition of the πνεῦμα in any sense, but the full conviction of an *educated* conscience, which is here referred to.—Wordsworth has a quaint fancy respecting the verb πληροφορείσθω: "Let him sail on quietly, as it were, with a fair wind of persuasion filling the sails of his own mind." He adds: "There may be a πληροφορία, a strong wind of persuasion, which will not waft a man to the harbor of Truth, but wreck him on the quicksands of Error."—R.]

[εὐχαριστεῖ γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ]. The thanksgiving at the table (Matt. xv. 36; xxvi. 26, &c.) is a proof that, with pious feeling and a good conscience, he consecrates his food and his enjoyment to God as a thank-offering. [Alford: "Adduced as a practice of both parties, this shows the universality among the early Christians of *thanking God at meals*."—R.] —**And he who eateth not.** He who abstains from eating meat. Even he is thankful for his scanty meal.

Ver. 7. **For none of us liveth to himself** [οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτῷ ζῇ]. The Apostle designates the universal basis of the thought, that the Christian eats or does not eat to the Lord. This rests upon the fact that we exist here, that we live and die, to the Lord. Meyer says, correctly: The dative must be taken in the ethico-*telic* sense. This telic εἰς αὐτόν is, indeed, always connected with a δι' αὐτοῦ and ἐξ αὐτοῦ; although the objective dependence on Christ (Rückert, Reiche) is not directly meant, and, in an absolute sense, all these terms apply, through Christ, to God.

Ver. 8. **We die unto the Lord** [τῷ κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκομεν. See *Textual Note* [7].] Even the Christian's dying is an act of consecration to the glory of Christ (Bengel: *eadem ars moriendi, quæ vivendi*).

Whether we live, therefore, or die, &c. [ἐάν τε οὖν ζῶμεν ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν, κ.τ.λ.] This proposition does not merely serve to establish the foregoing (we eat or do not eat), but to explain and elucidate it. The stronger form, the stronger antithesis of living and dying, underlies the eating and not eating. But both coincide in our being the Lord's (belonging to Him). [Alford: "We are, under all circumstances, living or dying (and *à fortiori* eating or abstaining, observing days or not observing them), CHRIST'S: His property."—Meyer: "In the thrice-repeated and emphatic τῷ κυρίῳ (τοῦ κυρίου) notice the *divina Christi majestas et potestas* (Bengel), to which the Christian knows himself to be entirely devoted." —R.]

Ver. 9. **For to this end Christ died and lived again** [εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἔζησεν. See *Textual Note* [8].] The telic definition of the death and resurrection of Christ serves, on the other hand, to establish our living and dying to the Lord. The ἔζησε here, as in Rev. ii. 8, designates Christ's return to eternal life, hence the ἀνέστη is passed over. Olshausen would understand the ἔζησε to be the earthly life of Jesus (therefore taken as a *Hysteron proteron*). Thereby a uniformity would, at all events, be constituted by the statement: we live or we die, but a dissimilarity would be called forth in relation to what follows. Meyer properly brings out also the fact that the κυριότης of the Lord is established on His death and resurrection. But it is in harmony with the *telic* definition of Christ's dominion that the antithesis in this life—the *living and the dead*—recedes behind the antithesis in the future life, the *dead* (in the act of dying and in Sheol) and *the living*, by whom it is conditionally established.

Both of the dead and the living. According to Meyer's suggestion, the purpose is not to refer the effects of Christ's death and return to life (as sundered) to the dead and to the living respectively (see his note on p. 497).

Ver. 10. **But why dost thou judge.** The σύ is here opposed to the dominion of Christ over the dead and the living, as above, to another man's servant; but the latter is now denoted brother.

Or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? The Apostle, having spoken of the weaker one, now speaks these words to the stronger, in order to maintain his harmonizing position. Here, as well as in the supporting of him who stands, ver. 4, and in the thanksgiving in ver. 6, the Apostle goes back to the highest causality (see *Textual Note* [9]).

For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God [πάντες γὰρ παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ]. We must appear before the judgment-seat of God himself, which Christ shall administer as Lord (chap. ii. 16; Acts xvii. 31; comp. Matt. xxv. 33; Acts xxvi. 6). The judging of one's brother, therefore, first, encroaches upon Christ's office as ruler, and, second, anticipates the judgment-bar of God.

Ver. 11. **For it is written.** Isa. xlv. 23. On the free form of the citation from memory, and from the LXX., see Philippi, p. 571. [See also *Textual Note* [10].—R.] On ἐξομολογεῖσθαι, with the dative, meaning *to praise* (Rom. xv. 9; Matt. xi. 25, &c.), see Tholuck, p. 719; Meyer, p. 498. [Meyer says the verb with the dative always means: *to praise;* with the accusative of the object: *to confess* (Matt. iii. 6, &c.).—R.] That special kind of praise, however, is meant, which occurs after a finished act of Divine Providence according to a Divine decision (see Phil. ii. 11). Tholuck says: "Isa. xlv. 23 does not speak of the appearance of Christians before the judgment-seat of God, but of mankind's universal and humble confession of dependence upon God." But this unwarrantably removes the element of *future time*, the eschatological element, which is, at all events, also comprised in the passage in Isaiah. Meyer says, somewhat better: "In Isaiah God makes the assurance by an oath, that all men (even the heathen) shall reverently swear allegiance to Him. Paul here regards this Divine declaration which promises messianic victory, because it promises the universal victory of the theocracy, according to the special and final fulfilment that it shall have in the general judgment." * —That even the prophetic passage itself comprises, with Christ's saving advent, also the eschatological references, follows from the definite prospect that every knee shall bow before Jehovah, &c. (see Phil. ii. 10, 11).

Ver. 12. **So then every one, &c.** [See *Textual Note* [11].] Meyer puts the emphasis on ἕκαστος, Philippi on τῷ Θεῷ, others on περὶ ἑαυτοῦ. The first is preferable.—R.] In this lies the ground of the following exhortation (ver. 13): **Let us not therefore judge one another any more** [μηκέτι οὖν ἀλλήλους κρίνωμεν]. The Apostle here comprises both parts, and thereby makes his transition to the following admonition to the strong.

B. Chap. xiv. 13–xv. 1. *On giving offence and despising.* "Exhortation to the strong" in particular.

Ver. 13. **But judge this rather** [ἀλλὰ

* ["With the reading τοῦ Χριστοῦ (ver. 10), Theodoret, Luther, Calvin, and many others, so Philippi, have found in τῷ Θεῷ a proof of the divinity of Christ. But the fundamental idea is rather, that it is *God*, whose judgment *Christ* holds; which thought is contained in the reading τοῦ Θεοῦ (ver. 10) also;" Meyer. It is quite unnecessary to found arguments on disputed readings, when so many other passages are at hand. Most of those who thus do, are naturally influenced in their critical judgments by their doctrinal positions.—R.]

τοῦτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον]. The κρίνατε. The Apostle uses the same word in a changed meaning, in order to emphasize more particularly, by this antanaclasis, the antithesis to judging. The consideration of the future judgment should move believers in particular to so conduct themselves as to give offence to no one (Matt. xviii. 6 ff.). Meyer: "Let that be your judgment."

Not to put a stumbling-block or an occasion of falling in a brother's way [τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ σκάνδαλον]. It does not follow that, because the expressions πρόσκομμα and σκάνδαλον are, in general, used metaphorically as synonyms, we would here have to accept a "verbosity in the interest of the case" (Meyer). In ver. 21 we find even three special designations: προσκόπτει ἢ σκανδαλίζεται ἢ ἀσθενεῖ. There also, however, Meyer, with others, regards the threefold designation as only the expression of the urgency of the matter. But in a real reference, the twofold effect of the *giving offence* comes into consideration. The giving offence is either an occasion for the punctilious brother to become embittered and still more hardened in his prejudice, or to conduct himself frivolously, without an understanding of the principle of freedom, and thus, according to the present passage, eat meat with inward scruples of conscience.* The Apostle indicates the first case in ver. 15, and the second in ver. 23. The use of different expressions, in themselves synonymous, to denote this antithesis, was quite natural, and, in ver. 21, the Apostle seems to distinguish even three cases: to take an offence forward, or backward, or to be strengthened in weakness. Even to this very day, the offence which the Jews *take* at Christianity is divided into the two fractions of extreme legality and of wild liberalism. The τιθέναι causes us to return to the original sense of the words (see the Lexicons).

Ver. 14. **I know, and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus** [οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ]. He knows it already as an Old Testament monotheist, who knows that God **is** the Creator of all things (1 Tim. iv. 3, 4; Gen. i. 31). But he also has the fixed assurance of it in the fellowship of Christ, by virtue of justifying faith in His Spirit. Calovius: *libertate a Christo parta.* [Alford: "These words give to the persuasion the weight not merely of Paul's own λογίζομαι, but of apostolic authority. He is persuaded, in his capacity as connected with Christ Jesus, *as having the mind of Christ.*" So Hodge, substantially, but with less exactness, since he retains the incorrect *by* of the E. V. It is doubtful whether ἐν ever has this force. Jowett, however, calls these words: "the form in which St. Paul expresses his living and doing all things in Christ, as, in language colder and more appropriate to our time, we might say as 'a Christian.'" But this is a dilution of the force of the expression.—R.] A consciousness of Christ's declaration in Matt. xv. 11 is here more probable than questionable; but then that declaration is not in a legal sense the basis of his freedom (comp. also 1 Cor. viii. 8; Col. ii. 14–16).

Unclean; κοινόν, profane, unclean in the religious legal sense (see the *Commentary on Matthew*, p. 277; the *Commentary on Mark*, p. 64). Levitically unclean was, indeed, even still a type of what was common or unclean in the real spiritual sense (Heb. x. 29).

Of itself, δι' αὐτοῦ, not according to Lachmann's reading, δι' αὐτοῦ. [See *Textual Note* [12].] *Of itself*, according to its nature, in contrast with the economical order, the moral convenience, or the natural feeling or conscience of the one partaking. [Theodoret, reading αὐτοῦ, refers it to Christ.—R.] "The Apostle himself belongs to the strong (comp. ἡμεῖς in chap. xv. 1, and 1 Cor. ix. 22);" Tholuck. But he also again distinguishes himself from the ordinarily strong one, in that he takes into the account, as a co-determining factor, conscience and regard to fraternal intercourse, or habitual practice.—[**But to him**, εἰ μὴ τῷ. This introduces an exception to *unclean*, not to *unclean of itself*. Hence not = ἀλλά, but = *nisi* (Meyer).—R.]—**To him it is unclean.** With emphasis. [The uncleanness is accordingly *subjective* (Meyer).—R.]

Ver. 15. **For if** [εἰ γάρ. See *Textual Note* [13].] The less authenticated reading εἰ δέ seems at the first glance to be most suitable; but the reading εἰ γάρ seems to compel us to accept, that even the strong one, who knows that a certain kind of food seems unclean to his weak brother, makes himself unclean by eating it to his offence.*

Because of thy meat thy brother is grieved [διὰ βρῶμα ὁ ἀδελφός σου λυπεῖται. Βρῶμα, that food which he holds to be unclean. Bengel calls this *meiosis*. Comp. Heb. ix. 10; xii. 16; xiii. 9.—R.] The difficulty occasioned by the expression λυπεῖται, is due to a neglect to distinguish properly the two kinds of offence. First of all, the question here is concerning that offence which consisted in the weak one's being made to stumble by the strong one's eating of meat. Tholuck: "λυπεῖν, according to the New Testament use of language: to afflict;" therefore λυπεῖσθαι is taken by expositors (Origen) = σκανδαλίζεσθαι. But would he who *took offence* at the eating be thereby induced to imitate the example?—According to the Apostle, it was, at all events, the one who ate, notwithstanding the offence he had taken, but not the other, who was irritated and felt himself aggrieved as much by the supposed pride as by the inconsiderateness of the strong one. "But such an affliction," says Philippi, "would be the beginning of the judging forbidden by the Apostle, which he therefore would not recommend to special regard."

* [Philippi, Stuart, Hodge, Jowett, and most, regard the two expressions as synonymous, the latter perhaps explanatory of the former. Alford distinguishes: "an occasion of stumbling, in *act*; an occasion of offence, in *thought*." Webster and Wilkinson: "A larger obstacle against which we may strike the foot; a smaller one likely to catch the foot. The former denotes a *certain*, the latter a *probable*, cause of falling.—Wordsworth gives as a commentary on this verse, some extracts from Hooker, in reference to the non-conformists. These remarks are eminently "*judicious*," but have a flavor of remote antiquity in their allusions to "obedience to rites and ceremonies constituted by *lawful public authority*."—R.]

* [If δέ be read, then this verse introduces a limitation to the practical application of the principle of ver. 14 (Hodge); but if γάρ be read, then we must take the passage as breviloquent or elliptical. Tholuck and Meyer join with εἰ μή, κ.τ.λ., finding here the statement of the reason why he must add that exception, viz., to oppose the uncharitableness which is involved in not regarding it. Alford makes it depend "on the suppressed restatement of the precept of ver. 13: *q. d.*, 'But this knowledge is not to be your rule in practice, but rather,' &c., as in ver. 13: '*for if*,' &c." Philippi objects to both views, and urges his objections against the better sustained reading. He says Meyer's interpretation is "manifestly too far-fetched;" but his own lay so near, that the temptation to alter the text was as strong as the desire to sustain the change against overwhelming evidence seems to be in the case of some commentators.—R.]

What! a prejudiced man's being afflicted itself the beginning of judging? Philippi, in harmony with Elsner, ignores the subjective justification of this affliction, by interpreting the λυπεῖν according to the signification frequently occurring in the classics: to *prejudice*, to *injure*. Meyer, on the other hand, urges against this the New Testament use of language, and understands the expression to mean moral mortification, an insult to the conscience, with reference to Eph. iv. 30.* Grotius, and others, have referred the word to the affliction produced by the charge of narrowness. The charge of narrowness comprised in reckless "eating" does, indeed, come into consideration as a *single element*, but it is not the principal thing.

Thou art no longer walking according to love [οὐκ ἔτι κατὰ ἀγάπην περιπατεῖς]. For the one giving offence injures love, and also makes himself unclean.

Destroy not by thy meat, &c. [μὴ τῷ βρώματι, κ.τ.λ.] Comp. 1 Cor. viii. 10, 11. But it does not follow from this analogy (of 1 Cor.), that the brother is, in all cases, led only, by a narrow and frivolous eating with others, to infidelity to his conscience, and that it is only by means of this that he incurs the danger of the ἀπώλεια, or actually relapses into a state leading to this. The exasperations of the one falling back upon ordinances lead to fanaticism and the ἀπώλεια, just as surely as laxities lead to antinomianism. Meyer says: "The occasion to fall from Christianity (Theophylact, Grotius, &c.) is not at all taken into consideration.† But can there be, in the case of Christians, a relapse into the ἀπώλεια without a real apostasy from Christianity? Bengel: *Ne pluris feceris tuum cibum, quam Christus vitam suam.*‡

Ver. 16. **Let not then your good be evil spoken of** [μὴ βλασφημείσθω οὖν ὑμῶν τὸ ἀγαθόν. See *Textual Note* [14]. De Wette thus explains the connection of οὖν with what precedes: "If this does not take place, then your good will not be evil spoken of."—R.] What is the good which the Apostle speaks of, and in how far is it exposed to slander? Explanations:

1. τὸ ἀγαθόν is *Christian freedom* ("in relation to eating meat"), Origen, Thomasius, Grotius, and others; Tholuck, with reference to 1 Cor. x 29, 30. Then the reference to the eating of meat is evidently nothing more than an accidental consistency of Christian freedom in its general meaning.* De Wette and Philippi, on the contrary, observe that the matter in question here is the possession not of a single party, but of the whole Church But Tholuck aptly replies: "This freedom was objectively purchased for the whole Church." Therefore also the reading ἡμῶν does not pronounce against this explanation.

2. Theodoret, De Wette, Philippi: *faith*. [Luther, Melanchthon, Hodge, &c.: the gospel. In fact, this is the view of Philippi: *doctrina evangelica*.—R.]

3. The kingdom of God, in ver. 17. [So Ewald, Umbreit, Meyer. With proper restrictions, this view seems least objectionable. (2.) and (3.) imply that the evil-speaking is from without the Church.—R.]

Unquestionably ver. 17 is an explanation of ver. 16, but the kingdom of God is here described as a treasure and enjoyment of faith, and there it is the first element: righteousness through Christ = freedom from human ordinances; see Gal. v. 1. The explanations harmonize, in maintaining that the question is concerning the Christian good, κατ' ἐξοχήν. And this good must be named objectively the gospel, and subjectively faith; or, if we comprise both these elements, the kingdom of God. It obscures the text to rend these things asunder by *aut, aut*. But it is unmistakable that the Apostle speaks relatively of this good, as it is represented in the freedom of faith enjoyed by renewed mankind. Now. as the punctilious Jewish Christians, and particularly the Jews, saw many Christians abusing their freedom, they were exposed to the danger, from this abuse of freedom, to abuse and finally to slander freedom itself, and even the gospel, according to a confusion of fanaticism similar to what occurs in our day, when men confound the Reformation with revolution, with the Münster fanaticism, with sectarianism, and apostasy from Christianity. Paul already had a sufficiently bitter experience in the impossibility of avoiding such slanders, even when the greatest care is observed; he all the more regarded it as an obligation of wisdom and love, to admonish those who were free to make a proper use of their freedom. We must not, however, consider the slander of Christian freedom in itself alone, apart from its principle, faith. Besides, this one slander of Christians against Christians had, as its result, another: that the Gentiles abused Christianity because of its division, and perhaps the proudest among them made it a subject of derision, that Christians contended about eating and drinking, as if these things were the real blessings of the kingdom of heaven. This latter feature is the explanation of Cocceius.

Ver. 17. **For the kingdom of God.** [Γάρ. If the reference in ver. 16 be to freedom, then the connection is: Preserve your liberty from such evil

* [Dr. Lange's view appears to be correct, but some remarks must be added for the sake of clearness. The weak brother is evidently the one who is "grieved." The offence of the strong brother is one against charity; hence the objection of Philippi, about Paul's paying special regard to the very judging he had forbidden, is altogether irrelevant; since charity is not to be measured by the propriety of the demands made upon it by the weak brethren. We reject the meaning *injure*, and (with Meyer) take λυπεῖται in a subjective sense. It must be distinguished from ἀπόλλυε, to which it leads as a possible result (Meyer, and others). It does not necessarily imply that the weak brother is led to imitate and thus to offend against his own conscience, although this is a probable result. Wordsworth suggests, as part of the injury, that he is led "to make a schism in the Church by separating from thee."—R.]

† [In his 4th edition, Meyer omits all reference to this point. Philippi, however, calls this verse a *dictum probans* for the possibility of apostasy. But as Dr. Hodge remarks: "Saints are preserved, not in despite of apostasy, but from apostasy. If they apostasize, they perish."—R.]

‡ [It is evident that ἀπώλεια refers to eternal destruction, since Christ offered His life to redeem from this (Meyer); yet, as this destruction (like the antithetical notion, eternal life) begins here, according to the scriptural representations, we must take it in its widest sense.—Alford thus paraphrases the verse, bringing out the contrast implied in the use of βρῶμα: "The mere λυπεῖν your brother, is an offence against *love;* how much greater an offence, then, if this λυπεῖν end in ἀπολλύειν—in raising (causing to act against his conscience, and so commit sin, and be in danger of quenching God's Spirit within him) by a MEAL of thine—a brother, for whom Christ died!"—R.]

* [Alford: "*Your strength of faith is a good thing; let it not pass into bad repute.*" This is more exact, and avoids borrowing an interpretation from 1 Cor. x. Yet it is still more open to the objection, that the matter here referred to is a possession of the whole Church. The change to the plural (ὑμῶν), its emphatic position, and the phrase τὸ ἀγαθόν itself, sufficiently attest the correctness of the view, which refers this "*good*" to the whole Church.—R.]

speaking, since nothing spiritual is involved. If, however, Meyer's view be adopted, then a motive is presented here, with a reference to the tenor of the evil-speaking—*i. e.*, the blasphemy would consist in such a wrong estimate of Christianity, or the kingdom of God in the minds of those without. The advantage of taking the wider view of ver. 16 becomes obvious here. For if it be restricted to the *strong*, then this verse must be so restricted also, when its most necessary application is to the *weak* brethren.—R.] The βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, typified by the Old Testament theocracy, is God's dominion over the heart, instituted and administered by Christ; it is the heavenly sphere of life, in which God's word and Spirit govern, and whose organ on earth is the Church. Here, too, Meyer mixes up the second advent: there is "also here nothing else than the messianic kingdom, which shall be set up at the second coming of Christ."

Is not eating and drinking [βρῶσις καὶ πόσις. Comp. Col. ii. 16. The act of eating and of drinking. The reference is obviously to the practice of both parties.—R.] Its nature does not consist in this. [Not as the Greek fathers interpret: it is not *won* by this.—R.] Meyer: "The moral condition of its (future!) nature does not depend upon it."

But righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost [ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ]. De Wette has full ground for contending against the shallow interpretations of these words, by a series of commentators from Chrysostom down to Meyer (Grotius and Fritzsche among the number), to the effect that the question here is only one of moral virtues. With Meyer, the "rectitude" naturally stands at the head. De Wette interprets these ideas in the full sense. Therefore he connects the doctrinal view (Calvin, Calovius, and others) with the ethical. [So Hodge, in last edition. In the earlier, he adopted the "ethical" view. But as he now says: "Paul does not mean to say that Christianity consists in morality—that the man who is just, peaceful, and cheerful, is a true Christian. This would be to contradict the whole argument of this Epistle."—R.] Accordingly, *righteousness* is, first of all, justification; *peace* is chiefly rest of spirit; and *joy in the Holy Ghost* is the joy of our spirit, which has its ground in the Holy Ghost.* But inasmuch as the question here is not so much concerning the virtues of God's kingdom as its blessings, the doctrinal view must be regarded as the principal thing. It might be said, as regards the concrete occasion [*i. e.*, the circumstances of the Roman Church]: *a.* With righteousness in Christ there is joined freedom from legality; *b.* With peace and the spirit of peace there are joined brotherly moderation and forbearance in the use of freedom; *c.* And with joy in the Holy Ghost there is joined the impulse to cultivate social joy through the proper tone of mind. Tholuck, with good ground, has cited chap. xv. 13 in favor of the religious construction of the three definitions; also 1 Thess. i. 6; Phil. iii. 1; 2 Cor. vi. 10. Grotius, and others, have interpreted the *joy* transitively, to establish joy; and this effect is, indeed, quite peculiar to the social impulse of Christian joy, which it has from heaven ("Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy"); but this element is not the principal and fundamental thought.

Ver. 18. **For he who herein serveth Christ.** Ἐν τούτῳ, according to Meyer, means: *according to this;* that is, according to the relation already given. Tholuck more fitly says: *herein.* The perception of the opposition between the inward and real and the unreal and outward in God's kingdom, and the cultivation of the former, is meant. So far ἐν τούτῳ is much stronger than ἐν τούτοις. [The singular is so strongly supported, that we must adopt it; see *Textual Note* [16]. But it has been referred by many commentators (from Origen to Jowett) to the Holy Ghost. Dr. Hodge assumes that this is the necessary view. But as Alford remarks: "It would be unnatural that a subordinate member of the former sentence, belonging only to χαρά, should be at once raised to be the emphatic one in this, and the three graces, just emphatically mentioned, lost sight of." This difficulty has led a number of commentators to retain the plural. But this is contrary to the received canons of criticism, and an unfair method of avoiding the difficulty.—R.]

Is well-pleasing to God, &c. [εὐάρεστος τῷ Θεῷ, κ.τ.λ.] He who, in the perception of this rule of the New Testament, serves Christ with pure motive, has the twofold blessing of being well-pleasing to God and **approved of men.** Among these men, the best among those who dissent are undoubtedly chiefly meant, for the really quarrelsome partisans are most embittered by the peaceful conduct of faith.*

Ver. 19. **Let us therefore follow after the things of peace** [ἄρα οὖν τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης διώκωμεν. The inference is from vers. 17, 18 (De Wette, Philippi, Meyer), not from the whole preceding context (Hodge). See *Textual Note* [18] on the form of the verb.—R.] The διώκειν is here in contrast with the impulse of party excitements.

The things which pertain to mutual edification [καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους]. *Edification* always comprises two elements, according to the figure which represents the Church as Christ's temple: 1. Arrangement into the fellowship of Christ by the awakening, vivification, and preparation of the stones; 2. Arrangement into the fellowship of the Church by the promotion of what is essential, and by moderation in the exercise of grace according to the spirit of humility and self-denial; see 2 Cor. x. 8; xiii. 10, and other passages. In this sense, each should build the other up.

Ver. 20. **Do not for the sake of meat undo the work of God** [μὴ ἕνεκεν βρώματος κατάλυε (pull down) τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ]. Instead of *building up*, the inconsiderate one tears down. The καταλύειν and λύειν are a specific expression of this fact. The work (building) of God has been understood as Christian faith, the σωτηρία, the extension of Christianity; Meyer, and others, have understood the Christian as such. ["*His* Christian personality."] But the οἰκοδομή here evi-

* [Alford prefers: "in connection with, under the indwelling and influence of," the Holy Ghost, to De Wette's view, which he, however, says is *true*, though not expressed here.—The phrase "in the Holy Ghost" does not qualify the whole clause, but "joy" alone. Dr. Hodge defended the wider reference in his earlier editions, perhaps to guard from error the "ethical" view of the terms, which he then adopted. In the last edition, he leaves the matter doubtful.—R.]

* [Calvin: "*Hunc probatum hominibus testatur, quia non possunt non reddere testimonium virtuti, quam oculis cernunt. Non quod semper filiis Dei parcant improbi.—Sed Paulus hic de sincero judicio loquitur, cui nulla est admista morositas, nullum odium, nulla superstitio.*—R.]

dently denotes the fellowship of faith. [This seems to combine the two favorite views, viz., that the fellow-Christian is here referred to—that the "kingdom of God" in its extension is meant. Alford, referring to 1 Cor. iii. 9, explains: "Thy fellow-Christian, as a plant of God's planting, a building of God's raising."—R.]

But it is evil [ἀλλὰ κακόν. Instead of δέ we have ἀλλὰ here. See Hartung, *Partikellehre*, ii. p. 403.—R.] To κακόν we must simply supply, from what precedes: *Every thing which is clean in itself* (Meyer). [Alford thinks nothing need be supplied, except, as in E. V., the neuter verb. "It is evil—*i. e.*, there is criminality in the man." On the other proposed supplements, see Meyer, Alford, *in loco*.—R.] *Κακόν, injurious* in this case, because it is not only a sin to him, but also leads him to ruinous frivolity; see ver. 15.

To the man who eateth through offence [τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίοντι]. By the one who eats, there can only be meant the *weak* one (according to Chrysostom, Luther [Meyer], and others), and not the *strong* one, according to the explanation of most commentators (Calvin, Grotius, De Wette [Hodge, Alford], and others). *But the address is directed to the strong.* Do not destroy for the sake of meat—that is, by thy inconsiderate and free enjoyment—the work of God, for, by the πρόσκομμα which thou givest thy brother, thou leadest him to eat against his conscience. For it is said, first, concessively: all things indeed are pure; second, the one eating with (taken, not given) offence to his conscience, is, as an injured one, contrasted with the one who destroys, who has given him offence; we have, besides, in the third place, the whole context.

[Those who find in *offence* a reference to the offence *given* by the strong one, rather than to the offence *taken* by the weak one, also urge the context in favor of their view. The context, however, only proves that the *strong* are *addressed* here. They incorrectly infer from this, that the κακόν must be predicated of the action of the party addressed. But is it not like Paul to urge, as a motive, the evil effect upon the brother taking offence? Besides, as Meyer suggests, the other view has no special connection with the former part of the verse, but gives us only the vague remark, that it is wrong to eat so as to give offence to others. The objection, that *offence* cannot well be applied to offence against one's own conscience, loses its force, when it is remembered that the *strong* are cautioned with reference to the effect of their conduct on the weak.—R.]

Ver. 21. **It is not good to eat flesh,** &c. [καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα, κ.τ.λ.] Luther, and others, incorrectly take καλόν as comparative in relation to ἐν ᾧ ["It is better that thou eatest no flesh and drinkest no wine, or (than) that thereon thy brother," &c.]. Probably to tone down the force of the expression, which seemed all too strong. But καλόν itself contains the necessary mitigation, since it denotes a higher and freer measure of self-denying love. [Dr. Lange renders it: *edel, noble.* The case is not hypothetical; the scrupulous demanded abstinence from wine also, we infer from the whole passage.—R.]

Not to do any thing wherein thy brother, &c. [μηδὲ ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός σου. See *Textual Note* [17].] Tholuck, and others, referring to 1 Cor. x. 31, would supply ποιεῖν with ἐν ᾧ, which is certainly more correct than to supply φαγεῖν ἢ πιεῖν. [The E. V. seems to imply the latter view; it is emended, therefore.] As De Wette properly remarks: Paul does not here lay down, as a definite precept, this principle of self-denying love according to which he had lived (see 1 Cor. viii. 13).* On the three expressions προσκόπτει, &c., see the explanation of ver. 13. [It is not necessary to find (with Calvin) a climax *ad infra* in these three verbs, yet they are not precisely synonymous. The figure of ver. 13 is retained, but the third verb expresses the mildest form of offence. De Wette, Philippi (and E. V.) render: *is made* (or *becomes*) *weak;* Meyer, Alford, and others, more correctly: *is weak.* The full thought, then, is: It is noble not to do any thing wherein thy brother is weak; even to avoid his weak point.—R.]

Ver. 22. **Hast thou faith?** [σὺ πίστιν ἔχεις; See *Textual Note* [18]. The briefer reading is adopted there.—R.] Meyer, with Calvin, Grotius, and others, take these words as interrogative; Tholuck, with Luther, Fritzsche, and others, as concessive, which corresponds better with the context.† [If ἣν be rejected, the interrogative form is to be preferred, as better suiting the lively character of the address (so Philippi, Alford, De Wette, Hodge, &c.). The question implies, on the part of the strong brother, an assertion: I have faith. The concessive view: *you have faith, I grant,* may imply the same. In fact, whatever reading or construction be adopted, the purport of the verse remains unchanged.—R.] Tholuck: "The stronger will depend upon his faith, but he should not come forward with it." That is, should not come forward with it in practical uncharitable *conduct;* but, on the other hand, he should not dissemble the *conviction* of his faith.

Have it to thyself [κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχε. *Keep it,* because well founded, but for the sake of thy brother, *keep it to thyself.*—R.] This comprises not only a restriction for the strong, but also a limitation of the principle previously established in ver. 21. Or, in his private life, where he gives no offence to his brother, he may also live according to his faith, yet according to the rule that he should regard himself as present to God.—**Before God.** [As God sees it, it need not be paraded before man (Meyer, Hodge).—R.] Tholuck explains the ἐνώπιον τ. Θεοῦ by thanksgiving.

Blessed is he, &c. [μακάριος, κ.τ.λ.] Luther: Blessed is he whose conscience does not condemn him in that which he allows. So also Meyer; Philippi, with reference to ver. 5: "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind." But we cannot expect here a simple declaration of the strong man's blessedness in opposition to the weak; and all the less so, because, immediately afterward, there is mention made of the weak one's sinful eating in doubt, which the strong man has occasioned by his offence.‡ Thus the proposition directs attention to

* [Hence, while a Christian may strive to reach such a principle in his practice, no brother, especially no "weak brother," has a right to demand it of him, or obtrude his stumbling, so as to exact self-denial from others.—R.]

† [Fritzsche opposes the interrogative form, because it would imply a negative answer. But there is little warrant for this. If the better correspondence with the context mentioned by Dr. Lange is based on this view of the force of the interrogative, then it disappears at once.—R.]

‡ [Philippi and Wordsworth make the clause apply to both classes; Meyer, to the strong alone (presenting the advantage they have, as a motive to considerate conduct toward the weak, whose danger is set forth in the next clause); Alford, and most, find here a commendation of the

the difference between the theoretical conviction and an inconsiderate conduct according to it. "Blessed is he whose conscience must not practically disapprove of what he, according to his theoretical conviction, approves." No one can have a perfect conviction of practical good conduct, if he make a false application of the theoretical conviction of faith against love; see 2 Cor. viii. 9–12; 1 Cor. ix. 19; x. 23. [This view of Dr. Lange, which seems to be peculiarly his own, implies a distinction so subtle, that it seems out of place in the practical part of the Epistle of this earnest Christian teacher. He adduces no arguments to support it, except the negative one, that the declaration of the strong man's blessedness can scarcely be expected here, especially when the danger of the weak one from the example of the strong one follows immediately. But as, in ver. 20, Paul refers to the evil done to the weak, as a motive to the strong whom he is addressing, so here he may present the blessedness of a strong conviction, and then the danger of a weak one, as a double motive to be careful of the weak brother. As the whole argument tends toward chap. xv. 1, this seems a satisfactory view.—R.]

Who judgeth not himself. The Apostle says *κρίνων*, and not *κατακρίνων* (as most commentators explain), because the Christian, with the unconscious and false application of a principle which is in itself righteous, and even holy, does not sin so ruinously as he who condemns himself by acting against his religious conviction.* With the germinating principle of faith in the weak one, the law is no more of authority; but so long as it applies to him in connection with faith, he cannot do violence to it. It is not by presumptuousness, but by mature conviction, that we become free.—[**Alloweth**, *δοκιμάζει*. *Agendum eligit* (Estius).—R.]

Ver. 23. **But he that doubteth** [*ὁ δὲ διακρινόμενος*]. With the act of eating, he is at the same time stricken and **condemned**, *κατακέκριται*; comp. John iii. 18. Meyer: "It was necessary to define more specifically the actual *self-condemnation* (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Grotius, and most commentators)." But there is a great difference between self-condemnation and actual self-condemnation. If the explanation, "to be subject to Divine condemnation," does not say: to be already subject to the final judgment, then must it be explained to mean, that a Divine sentence on his condemnable (not condemned) condition has occurred in his act itself, which sentence he must himself best experience in his own conscience, because the fact of his doubting is better known to himself than to any one else.†

Because it is not of faith [*ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως*]. Namely, that he ate. [Alford explains *of faith* here: "from a *persuasion of rectitude* grounded on and consonant with his life of faith. That '*faith in the Son of God*' by which the Apostle describes his own life in the flesh as being lived, informing and penetrating the motives and the conscience, will not include, will not sanction, an act done against the testimony of the conscience." This is, perhaps, more in accordance with Dr. Lange's view of *πίστις* (see below) than the ordinary interpretation, which confines it to mere *persuasion*, *moral* conviction (Hodge, De Wette, and most).—R.]

And whatsoever is not of faith is sin [*πᾶν δὲ ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἁμαρτία ἐστίν*]. To be read as a concluding sentence, and not as an explanation of the foregoing: because every thing which is not of faith, &c. [The E. V. (for) is incorrect; *and* should be substituted, *δέ* introducing, as Alford suggests, an *axiom*.—R.]—Conflicting explanations:

1. Augustine, and many other commentators; Calovius, &c.: which is not of Christian saving faith. Then the consequence is the proposition: The whole life of unbelievers is sin, even the morality and virtues of the heathen, &c. (*Formula Conc.* 700: where even the *peccata sunt* are moderated by the *peccatis contaminata*.)*

2. Moral faith, "the moral conviction of the rectitude of a mode of action" (De Wette, Reiche, and Meyer, after Chrysostom, and others). But undoubtedly Chrysostom's explanation shows a better knowledge of the connection between the requirement of saving faith and subjective conviction than many modern explanations, with all their fidelity to conviction. Even Grotius does not speak of conviction, but of conscience: *Peccatum est, quidquid sit*, CONSCIENTIA *non adstipulante.* There can be no perverted *decision of conscience* which *conscience* itself did not have to contradict, and consequently also no abstract and subjective certainty of conviction without an objective ground. But conscience itself harmonizes with God's law, just as the law harmonizes with the gospel and its faith. Otherwise, the world would be irretrievably lost in egotistic separation. How would we ever get at the wayward, if the truth did not testify to their conscience?

We accordingly have to distinguish in explana-

state in which the strong in faith are. His view (which is also that of Meyer and Hodge) is to be preferred to Dr. Lange's ingenious and refined distinction.—R.]

* [Meyer properly rejects the common view, which takes *κρίνων* as = *κατακρίνων*, but explains it thus: "*who does not hold judgment over himself*; *i. e.*, who is so assured in his conviction, that his decision to do this or that incurs no self-judgment." Dr. Lange's explanation is occasioned by his view of the whole sentence.—R.]

† [Meyer finds here an antithesis to "blessed" (ver. 22); but the idea of Divine condemnation must be properly limited. Philippi: "The act of eating itself condemns him, of course according to the *Divine* ordering, so that the justice of this verdict appears not only before God, but before men, and himself also."—R.]

* [It is greatly to be doubted whether this explanation necessarily involves this conclusion. It is easy to force upon this, or any other passage, some incorrect inference. For example, as Dr. Hodge well remarks: "It is wrong to do any thing which we think to be wrong. The converse of this proposition, however, is not true. It is not always right to do what we think to be right." Alford says "Here the Apostle has in view *two Christians*, both living by faith, and by faith doing acts pleasing to God: and he reminds them that whatever they do *out of harmony* with this great principle of their spiritual lives, belongs to the category of sin. The question touching the 'infidelis' must be settled by another inquiry: Can he whom we thus name *have faith*—such a faith as may enable him to do acts which are not sinful?—a question impossible for us to solve." Certainly the Augustinian inference may be deduced far more directly from other passages; and it should not prejudice any against the view which claims that Christian faith must underlie the "faith" here referred to. Bengel: "*Innuitur ergo ipsa fides, qua fideles consentur, conscientiam informans et confirmans; partim fundamentum, partim norma rectæ actionis.*" Hodge, Haldane, and Wordsworth, however, limit the meaning to something lik subjective *persuasion*, which seems tame and unpauline. The author last named shows the pernicious effects of the other view, especially among the Puritans. But the tone is so well adapted to the days of the Stuarts, that one may be excused for surmising the existence of a prejudice against the Augustinian view. Dr. Lange takes the same middle ground with Alford (see above), combining both views: "confidence proceeding from saving faith."—R.]

tion (2.) between conscience and subjective conviction in the usual sense; see chap. ii. 14, 15. In explanation (1.) we must distinguish: *a.* Between faith in a doctrinal system and saving faith itself; *b.* Between developed saving faith and its beginnings under *gratia praveniens*, the doing of the truth in the life of the upright; John iii. 21. It follows clearly enough from chap. ii., that the Apostle does not here mean to characterize such a conduct as sin. Yet, on the other hand, he will not designate such conduct as sinless; for, until the conscious reconciliation or perfection of conscience, even the better man is in an inward darkness and vacillation concerning his ways, and selfish motives are mixed even with his better actions. But the Apostle also does not speak here solely of the opposition in the life of Christians. Christians must be conscious of their opinion as well as of their action, in the light of truth itself. Philippi has brought out prominently the connection between (1.) and (2.). But he returns to a modified Augustinian view, by deducing from the claim that the confidence of the acceptability to God of an action must be the result of saving faith, the conclusion that all conduct is sin which has not this saving faith as its ultimate source and origin (p. 584).* It would be better to say: whose origin is not the shining of the Logos into the conscience. It is hazardous to regard believers as complete, but still more hazardous to distinguish only complete unbelievers from them. See the *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 1. On Augustine's view, see Reiche, ii. p. 489.

On the doxology following here in some Codd. (brought over from the conclusion), see the *Introduction*, p. 35 [and *Textual Notes* on chap. xvi.]; also on the controversies occasioned by the two concluding chapters. For further particulars, see Meyer, p. 507.†

Chap. xv., ver. 1. **Now we that are strong ought** [ὀφείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοί. The δέ does not stand for οὖν, as the E. V. indicates (so Hodge), although it connects with what precedes (Meyer, Philippi, &c.).—R.] Tholuck finds in δέ continuative a proof that the division of the chapter has been improperly made at this verse. As far as conviction is concerned, the Apostle stands on the side of the strong; see chap. xiv. 14, 20; 1 Cor. viii. 4.

[**To bear**, βαστάζειν]. After the Apostle has shown what the strong have to avoid, he shows what is now their duty toward the weak. In natural life, weakness is often oppressed and made to suffer violence by power; in the kingdom of the Spirit, on the contrary, "strong" expresses both the appointment to, and the duty of bearing, the infirmities of the weaker.

Infirmities of the weak [τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων. Meyer, Lange: *Glaubensschwachheiten*; but, with Philippi, Alford, &c., it seems best to regard the term as general, including, of course, the scruples above referred to.—R.] These are undoubtedly a *burden*, and thus an impediment to the progress of the strong; but in order to take the weak ones along with them, their weaknesses must be taken up—which is the rule in a caravan. But the bearing does not consist merely in suffering, but rather in forbearance. [Comp. Gal. vi. 2, Lange's *Comm.*, p. 149, where the same verb is used.—R.]

And not to please ourselves. Ἀρέσκειν see Gal. i. 10 [1 Cor. x. 33].

C. *Reciprocal edification, in self-denial, according to the example of Christ*, chap. xv. 2–4.

Ver. 2. **Let every one of us** [ἕκαστος ἡμῶν. See *Textual Notes* [19] and [20]]. Thus the Apostle here comprehends both parties.—[**For his good** (with a view) **to edification**, εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν.] Bengel: *Bonum* (ἀγαθόν) *genus, ædificat o species.* There is, first, εἰς, then, πρός. In order that one may aid the other in what is good, he should promote his edification, his sense for the fellowship of what is good. The good chiefly meant here is self-denying love, the constant exercise of humility.

Ver. 3. **For even Christ pleased not himself** [καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἤρεσεν. Dr. Lange renders: *Denn* (*selbst*) *auch Christus lebte nicht sich selber zum Gefallen.* The E. V. is more literal.—R.] See Phil. ii. 6; 2 Cor. viii. 9. *Pleasing one's self* denotes the inconsiderate and unfriendly pursuit of the ideals of our own subjectivity in the selfish isolation of our personal existence.

But, as it is written. &c. [ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται, κ.τ.λ. See *Textual Note* [21].] Ps. lxix. 9. The sentence is literally cited. On the different supplements suggested with ἀλλά, see

* [Philippi's view will not be understood unless more fully cited. He says: "πίστις here is not immediately justifying, saving faith, but the confidence springing therefrom, that all the action proceeding from it, and consistent with it, is acceptable to God. The proposition of Augustine, *omnis infidelium vita peccatum est*, finds here not, indeed, its direct, but its indirect proof. For, if every action which does not proceed from the confidence of its acceptableness to God is sin, and this confidence is the result of evangelical, saving faith alone, then it follows, that all conduct is sin which has not this saving faith as its ultimate source and origin."—R.]

† [*On chaps.* xv. *and* xvi. Baur of Tübingen has doubted the genuineness of these two chapters, but on such insufficient grounds that it is not necessary to enter upon the question. See *Introd.*, p. 35. Various theories have been suggested (by Semler, Paulus, Eichhorn, Schulz, Ewald, and now by Renan), which admit that Paul wrote these two chapters, but deny them a place in this Epistle. For this, a plausible ground is found in the insertion of the doxology at the close of chap. xiv., in the long list of acquaintances (chap. xvi.) at Rome, where Paul had never been—none of whom are mentioned in the Epistles written *from* Rome, especially in the salutation to Aquila and Priscilla, who were at Ephesus shortly before and shortly after the date of this Epistle. But Rome was the capital of the world, and many acquaintances might be there, and as readily depart. Were the salutations few, no doubt the critics would have urged this as an argument against its genuineness. Meyer says: "Among all the reasons which are adduced in support of these different opinions, none hold good, not even those which seem least founded upon mere arbitrariness." The *St. Paul* of Renan has just appeared. He accepts our Epistle as genuine, but denies the correctness of its title, and also its integrity. The following is a *résumé*: "The editors of the final and accepted text of Paul's letters had, for a general principle, to reject nothing and add nothing—but above all, to reject nothing. The common *body*, then, of the so-called Epistle to the Romans was a circular letter, an encyclical letter addressed to the churches of Ephesus and Thessalonica principally, but also to the brethren at Rome and one or more other places. Local and individual items were adjoined, according as the special destination of the general circular. These specialities were selected, and sewed on, so to speak, to the final edition, by honest editors, more desirous of saving all St. Paul's authentic words than of nice literary form. Here is the explanation of repetitions, and of salutatory phrase, in the midst of the Epistle to the Romans, otherwise inexplicable in the text of a so clean, straightforward, inelegant, but logical writer as St. Paul." It would seem that his view is but a vivacious and characteristic phase of the general theory advanced by the German authors named above.—R.]

Meyer, who would not supply any thing.* Grotius suggests the most natural one: *fecit*. The citation is from the LXX. The theoretical sufferer, who was reproached for the Lord's sake, was a type of Christ; but Christ's subjecting himself to the reproaches of the world proceeded from His steadfast fellowship with humanity for God's sake. For himself, He might have had joy; Heb. xii. 2, 3 [Alford: "The words in the Messianic Psalm are addressed to *the Father*, not to those *for whom* Christ suffered; but they prove all that is here required, that he He did not please himself; His sufferings were undertaken on account of the Father's good purpose—mere work which *He gave Him to do*."—R.]

Ver. 4. **For whatsoever things were written aforetime** [ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη. Justification of the previous citation (Philippi), and a preparation for the subject to be introduced next, viz., the duty of unanimity (Alford). In προ, just before the emphatic ἡμετέραν, Meyer correctly finds the thought: *All before our time*—*i. e.*, the whole Old Testament.—R.] This does not apply merely to the messianic prophecies (Reiche). The immediate design of the entire Old Testament Scriptures for the Jews does not preclude their universal purpose for all ages.

That we through the patience and the comfort of the Scriptures [ἵνα διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν. See *Textual Note* [23]. The repetition of διά seems to favor the view that γραφῶν depends on παρακλήσεως alone; yet many commentators, who adopt this reading, claim (and with reason) that such a construction would be ungrammatical. Still, Dr. Lange seems to favor it. We paraphrase: "the patience and comfort produced by a study of the Scriptures."—R.] Two things should support the believer, particularly in looking at the retarding, obstructing prejudice of the weak: First, the patience immanent in the Christian spirit (patience evidently suits better here than constancy, which Meyer prefers). [So Philippi, De Wette, &c.] Second, the comfort of the Holy Scriptures, which, in the present connection, consisted in the fact that, in spite of all the impediments to spiritual life in the Old Testament, the development to the New Testament nevertheless proceeded uninterruptedly.

Might have our hope [τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχωμεν. Dr. Lange: *might hold fast hope*. Others: might have more and more of the Christian hope. —R.] And then, this comfort was an encouragement to hold fast hope as the hope of better times; that is, of the ever newer and more glorious developments of God's kingdom, in Spener's sense. Beza, and others, properly explain: *teneamus*, which is opposed by Meyer. We can, indeed, preserve hope by patience, but not acquire it. According to Meyer, indeed, patience should also be referred to τῶν γραφ. (against Grotius, and others), and this should therefore imbue Christians. But yet the patience and comfort of the Scriptures could not mean, without something further: the patience and the comfort with which the Scriptures imbue us. [The genitive γραφῶν is joined with ὑπομονῆς also, by Chrysostom, and by most modern commentators. In fact, this is the only view which can be justified grammatically. "The patience and comfort produced by, arising from, a study of the Scriptures," is the simplest and best sense. So Alford, and most.—R.]—It is justifiably urged by Meyer, against Reiche, and others, that hope must here be taken subjectively. Of course, he who lets go his subjective hope, gives up thereby its object. [The hope is undoubtedly to be regarded as subjective, but the article (which we preserve in English by rendering: *our* hope) points to a definite Christian hope, viz., of future glory. It would then seem appropriate to understand "we might have hope" as referring to the obtaining of a higher degree of this hope through the patience, &c. (So Meyer, Philippi, De Wette). —R.]

* [So De Wette, Philippi, and others. The E. V., by putting a comma after "but," gives the same interpretation —*i. e.*, but the reproaches, as it is written, &c. The absence of any formula of citation favors this construction. —R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The present section contains a confessional *Eirenicon* of the Apostle. It requires: (1.) Reciprocal recognition of the common ground of faith. (2.) The balancing of the conviction of faith with the conduct of love. (3.) Above all, watchfulness against particular ethical errors on both sides. [The profound insight into human nature manifested in this chapter, combines, with the unparalleled adaptation of its precepts to the social life of men in all ages, to prove "the God of peace" its author. In America, where society is newest, most experimental, and yet public opinion so tyrannical, where, perhaps, the extremes of the weak and the strong are found, it deserves especial study.—R.]

2. As the name, *the weak*, is not an unconditional reproach, so *the strong* is not unconditional praise. The weak one's prejudice is a certain protection so long as he keeps his weakness pure—that is, does not make it a rule for others; the strong one's justifiable sense of freedom leads to the danger of self-boasting, particularly against love, which can draw in its train the loss of faith. These propositions can be proved by the example of pious Catholics and of wicked Protestants. Yet the standpoint of the strong man is in itself higher, and though he becomes very guilty by the abuse of his freedom of faith, the Apostle yet portrays, with very strong expressions, the ruin of those who *eat in doubt*. The unliberated ones, who would not be free in a positive, but in a negative, and therefore insufficient way, become the most unmitigated anomists and antinomians both in a religious and moral respect. If, in the time of the Reformation, all Protestants had become positively free by Christ, Protestantism would hardly have experienced in its history such great impediments of reaction as that of unbelief.

[Weak and strong, old and new, conservative and radical—these antitheses are not precisely synonymous, yet, in their leading features, the same. He does what Paul has not done, who throws himself entirely with one class or the other. The Church has ever contained, and has ever needed, both elements. Yet sometimes those are deemed radical who answer to the description here given of the *weak* brethren; and those who are truly *strong* are often classed with the old-fashioned.—The caution about judging is prophetic of what is so manifest in the history of Christ's Church in her imperfection: that more divisions and discords have arisen from the questions, about which the Apostle himself gives no definite decision, than from the discussion of the weightier matters of the earlier chapters —R.]

3. It is almost impossible to emphasize sufficiently the two distinctions to which the present section leads us. The Apostle shows, first, that we should not deny our free conviction, but should deny ourselves in reference to the inconsiderate conduct according to conviction in practical things, that do not belong to the testimony of faith. How often is this rule exactly reversed, by one's asserting a narrow view in order to please the weak (for example, in the condemning art, concerts, innocent relaxations, &c.), while he himself willingly enjoys occasionally the forbidden fruit.* The second distinction is brought just as closely home—namely, between doing and leaving undone. What one cannot do with the inward assurance of his conscience, must not be done at all.

4. The opposite tendencies that are presented to us as a germ in the Church at Rome, extend in continual gradations through the books of the New Testament, and confront each other in the second century as the matured opposites of Ebionitism and of Gnostic antinomianism.—On the relation between Gentile Christians and Jewish Christians at the time of Justin Martyr, see Tholuck, p. 704.

5. On the idea of weakness in faith, and conduct which is not of faith, see the *Exeg. Notes* on vers. 1 and 23; comp. Tholuck, p. 706 ff.

6. "For God is able to make him stand;" ver. 4. How gloriously this has been fulfilled! see the *Exeg. Notes*.

7. On the duty of striving after a certain conviction, and the means for attaining it (self-knowledge and gratitude), see the *Exeg. Notes* on ver. 5.

8. On ver. 6. Thanksgiving makes every pure Christian enjoyment a real peace-offering (שֶׁלֶם).

9. On ver. 8. On the Lordship of Christ, see Tholuck, p. 715 ff. Discussions on the divinity of Christ, on ver. 10, see Philippi, p. 572.

10. Every thing is pure. According to Olshausen (in respect to the laws on food), creation has again become pure and holy through Christ and His sanctifying influence. The proposition cannot be opposed, but how far must it be more specifically defined? As the creature of God, it has again been recognized as *pure and holy*. As a means of enjoyment, it has again been freely given in a religious sense. But as a real enjoyment, it is only pure and holy to the one enjoying, when he has the full assurance of his conscience, and therefore eats with thanksgiving. But in this the natural repulsion, practice, law, and a regard to love, limiting the circle of the means of enjoyment, as well as of the enjoyment itself, come into consideration, because they also limit that assurance.

11. The understanding of the present section has been rendered much more difficult by not regarding the manner in which the offence is divided into the two fundamental forms of irritation and presumption. See the *Exeg. Notes* on vers. 13 and 21.

12. Luther's expression, "the Christian is a master of all masters, a servant of all servants," comes into consideration here. Gregory the Great had expressed the same sentiment, but in a reverse order and application: "Free in faith, serving in love." The parable beginning with Matt. xviii. 23 tells us that the consistent and conscious offence against love weakens faith.

13. Bearing with the weak has: (1.) Its foundation in the fact that the *Almighty* God bears in love the world, which in itself is *helpless*; (2.) Its power and obligation consist in the fact that Christ has borne the guilt of the helpless world; (3.) And its dignity lies in the fact that the strength of the strong first finds in this function its whole truth, proof, and satisfaction.

14. On the idea of edification, see the *Exeg. Notes* on chap. xiv. 19.

15. The word of the Old Testament Scriptures is still of application; how much more, therefore, is this the case with that of the New Testament! Yet, in this relation, we dare not overlook the truth, that Christian life may have but *one* rule of faith, but yet two fountains: the Holy Scriptures, and the immediate fellowship of the heart with Christ, from which the patience of Christ flows.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

VERS. 1-12.

On the proper reciprocal conduct of the strong and weak in faith. 1. What form should it take? *a*. The strong should receive the weak, and not despise them; *b*. The weak should not judge the strong. 2. On what should it be established? *a*. On every body's remembering that God has received the other as well as himself; *b*. Therefore he should consider that, in whatever the other one does or leaves undone, he does it or leaves it undone to the Lord; *c*. Do not forget that the decision on our course of action belongs to the Lord alone, to whom we all belong, and before whose judgment-seat we must all appear (vers. 1-12).—Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? Two things are implied in this question of the Apostle: 1. Directly, a warning to guard against any judgment of faith on our brethren; 2. Indirectly, an admonition rather to judge ourselves, and to perceive the weakness of our own faith (ver. 4).—In matters of conscience, each one standeth or falleth to his Lord (ver. 4).—The great value of a strong religious conviction. 1. To ourselves. *a*. We act according to fixed principles; *b*. We do not vacillate; *c*. We preserve our inward peace. 2. To others. *a*. They know where they are with us; *b*. They therefore entertain confidence in us; *c*. Their own life is improved by our example (ver. 5).—The possibility of thanksgiving to God as a test of enjoying that which is allowed (ver. 6).—As Christians, we are the Lord's possession. 1. What is this? *a*. No one liveth to himself, and no one dieth to himself; that is, whether in life or in death no one belongs to himself; but, *b*. Whether we live, let us live to the Lord, or whether we die, let us die to the Lord; that is, we belong, in life and death, to Him; we are His. 2. By what means have we become the Lord's property? *a*. By Christ's death; *b*. By His resurrection

* [The emphatic deliverances of ecclesiastical bodies on matters of minor morals (even making doubtful matters terms of communion) must often be regarded by the careful reader of this chapter as overpassing the limits here set to bearing the infirmities of the weak. When that about which the Word of God makes no distinct utterance, is made a term of communion, those who are thus wise above what is written are not acting to "edification." It is but an attempt to make holy by an ecclesiastical law. If *God's* law could not do this "in that it was weak through the flesh," *man's* law is not likely to accomplish the result aimed at. "Strange as it may appear, it is nevertheless true, that scruples about lesser matters almost always involve some dereliction of duty in greater and more obvious ones" (Jowett). Comp. the very valuable dissertation of this author on "Casuistry," *Comm.* ii. pp. 322-357.—R.]

and glorification (vers. 7-9).—We shall all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ! This is said: 1. To the weak in faith, that he may not judge his brother; 2. To the strong, that he may not despise his brother; 3. To both, that they may examine themselves (vers. 10-12).—The great account which every one of us shall have to give in future. 1. Of whom? Of himself, on all that he has done and left undone. 2. Before whom? Before God, who knoweth the heart, and seeth what is secret (ver. 12).

LUTHER: There are two kinds of Christians: the strong in faith, and the weak. The former arrogantly despise the weak, and the latter easily get offended at the strong. Both should conduct themselves in love, that neither offend or judge the other, but that each do and allow the other to do what is useful and necessary (ver. 1).

STARKE: If one should be certain of his opinion in the use of things indifferent, how much more necessary is it in matters of faith! (ver. 5.)—HEDINGER: Stones in an arch support each other; so should you support your neighbor. You may know much, but your neighbor may be very useful; you should at least bear him witness that he has a tender conscience (ver. 1).—BENGEL: Gratitude sanctifies all acts, however different, that are not inconsistent with gratitude (ver. 6).—The art of dying well is nothing else than the art of living well (ver. 7).

GERLACH: An article of food is only unclean when eaten without thanksgiving; but every thing is holy to him who thankfully acknowledges that the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof (1 Cor. x. 25-31). Let him, on the other hand, who, through fear of breaking a Divine commandment, eats but one kind of meat, be thankful even for that which he does enjoy. Every thing depends on our acting in full obedience to the Lord, and in doing nothing wilfully and independently.

HEUBNER: The less scrupulous one must show tender forbearance; the more scrupulous one must guard against decrying the more liberal (ver. 3).—It is not becoming in us to pronounce any definitive opinion on the inward worth of a man.—We should not condemn even the fallen (ver. 4).—Christianity, as a free institution for the training of mankind, allows freedom in regard to services and in the choice of holy-days (ver. 5).—Every believer renounces his own will, lives to the Lord, who has purchased and redeemed him, and accordingly dies in harmony with the Lord.—This dependence on the Lord is something quite natural to the Christian. He, therefore, who will not be led by love to place a restraint upon himself on account of his weaker brother, but is obstinate, acts against that fundamental principle (vers. 7, 8).—He who judges, arrogates to himself Christ's office; he who bears in mind that Christ will judge us all, will no more condemn.

BESSER: To despise and to judge—each is as bad as the other, for in both man encroaches upon God's right, and arrogates to himself a judgment on another's state of faith and heart, which becomes an injury to his own life of faith (ver. 3).

SCHLEIERMACHER: New-Year's Sermon on vers. 7 and 8. The language of the text is placed before us as a motto on entering this new year of life: 1. In relation to what shall happen to us; 2. In relation to what we shall be required to do.

[CHARNOCK: Christ, by His death, acquired over us a right of lordship, and hath laid upon us the strongest obligation to serve Him. He made himself a sacrifice, that we might perform a service to Him. By His reviving to a new state and condition of life, His right to our obedience is strengthened. There is no creature exempt from obedience to Him. Who would not be loyal to Him, who hath already received: 1. A power to protect; 2. A glory to reward?

[JOHN HOWE: Receive the poor weakling, for God is able to make him stand. Every new-born child is weak, and we must remember that this is the case with every regenerate soul.

[BISHOP HOPKINS: On ver. 12. All the wickedness that men have brooded on and hatched in the darkest vaults of their own hearts, or acted in the obscurest secrecy, shall be then made as manifest as if they were every one of them written on their foreheads with the point of a sunbeam. Here, on earth, none know so much of us, neither would we that they should, as our own consciences; and yet those great secretaries, our own consciences, through ignorance or searedness, overlook many sins which we commit. But our own consciences shall not know more of us than all the world shall, for all that has been done shall be brought into public notice.

[HENRY: Though some Christians are weak and others strong, though of different sizes, capacities, apprehensions, and practices, in lesser things, yet they are all the Lord's. They serve Christ, and approve themselves to Him, and accordingly are owned and accepted of Him. Is it for us, then, to judge or despise them, as if we were their masters, and they were to make it their business to please us, and to stand or fall by our sentence?

[WESLEY, *Sermon on the Great Assize*, Rom. xiv. 10: Consider: 1. The chief circumstances which will precede our standing before the judgment-seat of Christ; 2. The judgment itself; 3. Circumstances which will follow it; 4. Application to the hearer.

[ROBERT HALL: The proper remedy for a diversity of sentiment is not the exercise of compulsory power, much less a separation of communion, but the ardent pursuit of Christian piety, accompanied with an humble dependence on Divine teaching, which, it may reasonably be expected, will in due time correct the errors and imperfections of sincere believers. The proper conduct to be maintained is a cordial coöperation in every branch of worship and of practice with respect to which we agree, without attempting to effect a unanimity by force.

[RICHARD WATSON, on vers. 7, 8: The extension of the work of Christ in every age goes upon the same principle. The principle of selfishness and that of usefulness are distinct and contrary. One is a point, but the centre is nothing; the other is a progressive radius, which runs out to the circumference. The one is a vortex, which swallows up all within its gorge; the other is the current-stream, which gushes with an incessant activity, and spreads into distant fields, refreshing the thirsty earth, and producing richness and verdure. The principle of one is contraction; of the other, expansion. Nor is this a sluggish or inactive principle. Lively desires for the acknowledgment of Christ by men, strong and restless jealousies for His honor, tender sympathies with the moral wretchedness of our kind, deep and solemn impressions of eternal realities, and of the danger of souls; these are the elements which feed it; and they carry Christian love beyond even the philanthropy of the natural law

[HODGE: Owing to ignorance, early prejudice, weakness of faith, and other causes, there may and must exist a diversity of opinion and practice on minor points of duty. But this diversity is no sufficient reason for rejecting from Christian fellowship any member of the family of Christ. It is, however, one thing to recognize a man as a Christian, and another to recognize him as a suitable minister of a church, organized on a particular form of government and system of doctrines.

[F. W. ROBERTSON: It is always dangerous to multiply restrictions and requirements beyond what is essential; because men, feeling themselves hemmed in, break the artificial barrier, but, breaking it with a sense of guilt, thereby become hardened in conscience, and prepared for transgressions against commandments which are divine and of eternal obligation. Hence it is that the criminal has so often, in his confessions, traced his deterioration in crime to the first step of breaking the Sabbath-day; and, no doubt, with accurate truth.—If God has judgments in store for England, it is because we are selfish men —because we prefer pleasure to duty, party to our church, and ourselves to every thing else.—J. F. H.]

VERS. 13-16.

On avoiding offence. 1. Offence cannot be avoided at the expense of personal freedom; 2. Just as little can it be avoided at the expense of love toward a brother (vers. 13-16).—If you would avoid stumbling or offence, then preserve: 1. Your personal freedom; 2. But do not injure love toward a brother, for whose sake Christ died (vers. 13-16).—Nothing is unclean in itself; much is unclean if one so regard it (ver. 14).—Take care that your treasure be not evil spoken of! 1. What is this treasure? Spiritual freedom. Comp. ver. 6; 1 Cor. x. 30; 1 Tim. iv. 4. 2. How can it be protected against slander? When the strong man in faith rejoices in its possession, but at the same time walks charitably (ver. 16).

LUTHER: The gospel is our treasure, and it is evil spoken of when Christian freedom is so boldly made use of as to give offence to the weak.

STARKE, HEDINGER: Take heed, soul, lest you give offence! No stumbling-stone, no sin, however small you think it may be, is really small if it can make a weak one fall. Use the right which you have, but use it aright; Matt. xvii. 24 (ver. 13).

GERLACH: It is not our office to judge our brother, and to decide on his relation to God; but it is every Christian's office to pronounce decidedly against uncharitableness, which can condemn another to his fall.

HEUBNER: The treasure is Christian freedom, deliverance from outward ordinances. It is evil spoken of *either* by the enemies of the Church, when they see the dissension of Christians, *or* by the weaker brethren, when they condemn the stronger, and use their freedom presumptuously, *or* by the stronger, when they give offence to the weaker, and injure their conscience (ver. 16).

BESSER: It is a true proverb: "Though two do the same thing, it is not really the same thing," for not the form of the deed, but the sense of the doer, decides as to whether any thing is unclean or holy, or contrary to faith and love (ver. 14).

[JEREMY TAYLOR: In a ripe conscience, the practical judgment—that is, the last determination of an action—ought to be sure and evident. This is plain in all the great lines of duty, in actions determinable by the prime principles of natural reason, or Divine revelation; but it is true also in all actions conducted by a right and perfect conscience. There is always a reflex act of judgment, which, upon consideration that it is certain that a public action may lawfully be done, or else that that which is but probable in the nature of the thing (so far as we perceive it) may yet, by the superadding of some circumstances and confidential considerations, or by equity or necessity, become more than public in the particular. Although, I say, the conscience be uncertain in the *direct* act, yet it may be certain, right, and determined, in the *reflex and second act of judgment;* and if it be, it is innocent and safe—it is that which we call the right and sure conscience (*The Rule of Conscience*, *Works* [BISHOP HEBER's edition], vol. xi. pp. 369-522).

CLARKE: It is dangerous to *trifle with conscience*, even when *erroneous;* it should be borne with and instructed; it must be *won* over, not *taken by storm*. Its feelings should be respected, because they ever refer to God, and have their foundation in His fear. He who sins against his conscience in things which every one else knows to be indifferent, will soon do it in those things in which his salvation is most intimately concerned. It is a great blessing to have a *well-informed* conscience; it is a blessing to have a *tender* conscience, and even a *sore* conscience is better than none.

[BARNES: Christ laid down His precious life for the weak brother as well as for the strong. He loved them; and shall we, to gratify our appetites, pursue a course which will tend to defeat the work of Christ, and ruin the souls redeemed by His blood? —Do not so use your Christian liberty as to give occasion for railing and unkind remarks from your brother, so as to produce contention and strife, and thus to give rise to evil reports among the wicked about the tendency of the Christian religion, as if it were adapted only to promote controversy.—J. F. H.]

VERS. 17-23.

The glory of God's kingdom as a kingdom: 1. Of righteousness; 2. Of peace; 3. And of joy in the Holy Ghost (ver. 17).—God's kingdom is: 1. Not a kingdom of dead ordinances, by which the conscience is oppressed; but, 2. A kingdom of living, evangelical truth, by which righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost are planted and promoted (ver. 17).—God's kingdom is a kingdom which: 1. Rests on righteousness; 2. In whose borders peace reigns; 3. To belong to which brings joy to the hearts of all its citizens (ver. 17).—The blissful service of Christ. 1. The service is in righteousness, &c.; 2. The blessing: *a.* That we are acceptable to God; *b.* That we are approved of men (vers. 17, 18).

For what should members of the Christian Church strive, if in most important matters they are one, but in unessential matters they have different views? 1. For what makes for peace; 2. For what contributes to edification (ver. 19).—Even the weaker brother's Christian life is God's work; therefore be indulgent toward his conscience! (ver. 20.) —Rather deny self than offend a brother (ver. 21) —The happiness of Christian freedom (ver. 22).—The condemnation of the doubting conscience (ver

23).—What is not of faith is sin. 1. How often is this expression misunderstood! *a.* When it is supposed that all the virtues of the heathen are glaring sins; *b.* When all the civic righteousness of unconverted people is condemned in like manner; *c.* When the whole civilized life of the present day receives the same judgment. Therefore, 2. There arises the serious question, How should it be understood? *a.* As a declaration which has no application whatever to the heathen, or to unconverted people in Christendom, but strictly to awakened professors of religion; and, in consequence thereof, *b* Contains an appeal to them to do nothing which cannot be done with the full joy of faith (ver. 23).

LUTHER, on ver. 23: Observe, that all this is a general declaration against all works done without faith; and guard against the false interpretations here devised by many teachers.

STARKE: A reconciled and quiet conscience is the workshop of spiritual joy (ver. 17).—OSIANDER: The most certain rule of conduct for using Christian freedom, is to contribute to our neighbor's edification and improvement, but not to his downfall and ruin (ver. 19).

SPENER: The Apostle would say (ver. 17), that you should be careful of nothing but God's kingdom. Where this is promoted, it should make you rejoice, and it should grieve you when it suffers. That, on the other hand, which does not concern God's kingdom, should be regarded by you as a small matter.

GERLACH: The righteousness which avails in God's kingdom is not an outward observance of the law, but inward holiness; the peace with God which we have in it overflows to our brethren, and holy joy destroys both all anxiety and every thing which can offend and grieve our neighbor (ver. 17).

LISCO: To attach importance to eating and drinking, to hold that there should henceforth be *no* scruple at certain kinds of food, or that, on the other hand, this or that should be renounced, is no sign of true Christianity (ver. 17).

HEUBNER: The mistaking of what is essential in Christianity, makes us petty; while laying stress on merely secondary matters unfits us for accomplishing the principal object (ver. 17).—That which is allowed may be sin: 1. When we do it against our conscience: 2. When we thereby offend others (ver. 21).

BESSER: Every Christian and all Christendom are God's work and building (1 Cor. iii. 9). It is blasphemy against God's sanctuary to *destroy* this work by ruining a brother sanctified by Christ's blood (ver. 15), and by sundering the bond of peace, which keeps the blocks of the divine building in place (ver. 20).—Every thing which is of Christian faith is truly good, because the doer is good by faith, and his deed is love, the fulness of all good deeds (ver. 23).

[LEIGHTON: There is no truly comfortable life in the world but that of religion. Religion is joy. Would you think it a pleasant life, though you had fine clothes and good diet, never to see the sun, but still to keep in a dungeon with them? Thus are they who live in worldly honor and plenty, who are still without God; they are in continual darkness, with all their enjoyments.—The public ministry will profit little any way, where a people, or some part of them, are not one, and do not live together as of one mind, and use diligently all due means of edifying one another in their holy faith.—BURKITT: Observe: 1. That the love and practice of religious duties, such as righteousness and peace, is a clear and strong argument of a person's acceptance with God; 2. That such as are for those things accepted by God, ought by no means, for differing from us in lesser things, to be disowned of us, and cast out of communion by us.

[HENRY: Ways by which we may edify one another: 1 By good counsel; 2. Reproof; 3. Instruction; 4. Example; 5. Building up not only ourselves, but one another, in the most holy faith. None are so strong but they may be edified; none so weak but they may edify; and while we edify others, we benefit ourselves.—CLARKE: If a man's passions or appetite allow or instigate him to a particular thing, let him take good heed that his conscience *approve* what his passions *allow*, and that he live not the subject of continual self-condemnation and reproach. Even the man who has a too scrupulous conscience had better, in such matters as are in question, obey its erroneous dictates, than violate this moral feeling, and live only to condemn the actions he is constantly performing.

[HODGE: Conscience, or a sense of duty, is not the only, and perhaps not the most important, principle to be appealed to in support of benevolent enterprises. It comes in aid of and gives its sanction to all other right motives; but we find the sacred writers appealing most frequently to the benevolent and pious feelings—to the example of Christ—to a sense of our obligations to Him—to the mutual relations of Christians, and their common connection with the Redeemer, &c., as motives to self-denial and devotedness.—As the religion of the gospel consists in the inward graces of the Holy Spirit, all who have these graces should be recognized as genuine Christians; being acceptable to God, they should be loved and cherished by His people, notwithstanding their weakness or errors.—The peace and edification of the Church are to be sought at all sacrifices, except those of truth and duty; and the work of God is not to be destroyed or injured for the sake of any personal or party interests.—An enlightened conscience is a great blessing; it secures the liberty of the soul from bondage to the opinions of men, and from the self-inflicted pains of a scrupulous and morbid state of moral feeling; it promotes the right exercise of all the virtuous affections, and the right discharge of all our duties.—H. B. RIDGEWAY, on vers. 22, 23: The reason that the Church is so cold in her devotions, and so little comparative success attends her evangelizing efforts, is, that her confidence in God's promises and methods is paralyzed by a *self-accusing consciousness of delinquency.* There cannot be an overcoming faith in the people of God, except the Spirit of Him who fulfilleth all righteousness breathes and works in their hearts and lives.

[HOMILETICAL LITERATURE *on ver.* 17.—A. BURGESS, *Spiritual Revivings*, part i. 123; J. ABERNETHY, *Of the Kingdom of God*, *Serm.*, vol. iv. 155; S. CLARKE, *In what the Kingdom of God Consists*, *Serm.*, vol. vii. 233; H. WHISHAW, *The True Nature of the Kingdom of God*, *Serm.*, vol. ii. 91; S. BOURN, *On the Nature of the Christian Religion Disc.*, vol. ii. 259; L. HOLDEN, *Righteousness Essential to True Religion*, *Serm.*, 314; J. DODSON, *Joy in the Holy Ghost*, *Disc.*, 152; JAMES FOSTER, *The Kingdom of God, under the Dispensation of the Gospel*, *Serm.*, vol. ii. 313; BISHOP SHIPLEY, *Serm.*, *Works*, vol. i. 265; JOHN VENN, *The Nature of*

True Religion, Serm., vol. iii. 132; I. B. S. Carwithin, *The Brahminical System in its Operations on the Intellectual Faculties*, *Bampton Lectures*, 213; T. Dwight, *Joy in the Holy Ghost*, *Theology*, vol. iii. 308; John Garnons, *True Religion*, *Serm.*, vol. ii. 15; R. P. Buddicom, *The Inward and Spiritual Character of the Kingdom of God*, *Serm.*, vol. ii. 234; Bishop Jebb, *Serm.*, 71; H. Woodward, *Essays*, &c., 467; R. Montgomery, *The Church Viewed as the Kingdom of the Spirit, God and Man*, 118.—J. F. H.]

Chap. xv. 1-4.

Let us bear the infirmity of the weak without pleasing ourselves; for in this: 1. We seek to please our neighbor for his good, to edification; 2. We herein choose Christ as our pattern, who did not please himself (vers. 1–4).—For what purpose should the strong use the infirmity of the weak? 1. To humble himself; 2. To please his neighbor; 3. To imitate Christ (vers. 1–4).—On pleasing ourselves. 1. In what is its ground? *a.* In a man's regarding his views as the most correct; *b.* His efforts as the best; *c.* His words as the wisest; *d.* His deeds as the most godly; *e.* And, consequently, himself as insurpassable. 2. How is it shown? *a.* In the severe condemnation of the weak; *b.* In immoderate self-praise; *c.* In pretentious manners in society. 3. How is it to be overcome? *a.* By discipline in bearing the infirmities of the weak brethren; *b.* By an honest effort to please our neighbor for his good, to edification (comp. 1 Cor. x. 33); *c.* By a believing look at Christ, who did not please himself, but bore the reproaches of His enemies (vers. 1–4).—The blessing of the Holy Scriptures for our inward man (ver. 4).—The Holy Scriptures a fountain of hope (ver. 4).—Examples of patience and comfort, which the Scriptures present to us for awakening joyous hope: 1. From the Old Testament; 2. From the New Testament (ver. 4).

Roos: Bearing the infirmity of the weak is an exercise of meek love, which neither lightly esteems him who is weak, nor would seek to change him in a rough, vehement manner. To please ourselves, means to act according to our own views, whether another can be offended at them or not; or to so conduct ourselves as if we were in the world for our own sake alone, and not also for our weak brother's sake (vers. 2 and 3).

Gerlach: The Apostle here sets up Christ not merely as a pattern, but as a motive, and the living Author and Finisher of our life of faith (ver. 3).

Heubner: The reason why a man does not place himself under restraint, is pleasure with himself; and this hinders all peace, destroys the germ of love in the heart, and is a proof of spiritual weakness, prejudice, and a corrupt heart. He is not strong who cannot bear with others near him, nor tolerate their opinions (ver. 21).—The Bible is the only real and inexhaustible book of comfort; Paul said this even when there was nothing more than the Old Testament.—The Bible is not merely a *book to be read*, but *to be lived* [*nicht Lese-, sondern Lebebuch.*], Luther, vol. v., pp. 1707 (ver. 4).

[Jeremy Taylor: There is comfort scattered up and down throughout the holy book, and not cast all in a lump together. By searching it diligently, we may draw our consolation out of: 1. Faith; 2. Hope; 3. The indwelling of the Spirit; 4. Prayer; 5. The Sacraments.—Burkitt: The great end for which the Holy Scriptures were written, was the informing of our judgments, and the directing of our practice, that, by the examples which we find there of the patience of holy men under sufferings, and of God's relieving and comforting them in their distresses, we might have hope, confidence, and assurance, that God will also comfort and relieve us under the like pressures and burdens.

[Henry: Christ bore the guilt of sin, and the curse for it; we are only called to bear a little of the trouble of it. He bore the presumptuous sins of the wicked; we are called only to bear the infirmities of the weak.—There are many things to be learned out of Scripture; the best learning is that which is drawn from that fountain. Those are most learned that are most mighty in the Scriptures. As ministers, we need help, not only to roll away the stone, but to draw out the water; for in many places the well is deep. Practical observations are more necessary than critical expositions.

[Scott: Many venture into places and upon actions against which their own conscience revolts; because they are induced by inclination, or emboldened by the example of those who, on some account, have obtained the reputation of pious men. But they are condemned for indulging themselves in a doubtful case. In order to enjoy freedom from self-condemnation, we must have: 1. A sound judgment; 2. A simple heart; 3. A tender conscience; 4. Habitual self-denial.

[Robert Hall: Paul enjoins the practice of forbearance, on the ground of the *conscientiousness* of the parties concerned, on the assumption not only of their general sincerity, but of their being equally actuated, in the very particulars in which they differed, by an unfeigned respect to the authority of Christ; and as he urges the same consideration on which the toleration of both parties rested, it must have included a *something* which was binding on the conscience, whatever was his private judgment on the points in debate. The Jew was as much bound to tolerate the Gentile, as the Gentile to tolerate the Jew.

[Hodge: The desire to please others should be wisely directed, and spring from right motives. We should not please them to their own injury, nor from the wish to secure their favor; but for their good, that they may be edified.—Barnes: Christ willingly threw himself between the sinner and God, to intercept, as it were, our sins, and to bear the effects of them in His own person. He stood between us and God; and both the reproaches and the Divine displeasure due to them met on His sacred person, and produced the sorrows of the atonement. —His bitter agony in the garden and on the cross. Jesus thus showed His love of God in being willing to bear the reproaches aimed at Him, and His love of men in being willing to endure the sufferings necessary to atone for these very ones.

[Homiletical Literature *on ver.* 4: Bishop Latimer, *Sermons of the Plough*, *Works*, vol. i. 59; *Seven Sermons*, *Ibid.*, vol. i. 85; Bishop Patrick, *The Use of the Holy Scriptures* (London, 1678); W. Wotton, *Serm.* (1722); John Guyse, *Serm.* (1724); *Dispositions for Reading the Scriptures*, Pitman *from* Osterwald, 1*st Course*, vol. i. 15; J. Brailsford, *Revelation of a Future State in the Scriptures, an Argument for Comfort and Patience*, *Serm.*, 247; Thomas Adam, *Works*, vol. iii. 334; H. Draper, *The Authority, Excellence, and Use of*

the Holy Scriptures. On the Collects, vol. i. 24; JOHN HEWLETT, *The Things Written Aforetime for our Learning, Serm.*, vol. iv. 209; *The Duty of Studying the Holy Scriptures with Patience, Ibid.*, vol. iv. 227; *The Patience, the Comfort, and Hope to be Derived from the Holy Scriptures, Ibid.*, vol. iv. 246; R. L. COTTON, *Study of the Scriptures, Serm.*, 376; W. MACDONALD, *The Scriptures. Plain Sermons*, 24; C. GIRDLESTONE, *Holy Scripture. Farewell Sermons*, 165; G. R. GLEIG, *Sermons for Advent*, &c., 89; T. BOWDLER, *The Scriptures Given for Comfort. Sermons on Privileges*, &c., vol. i. 48; F. E. TUSON, *The Blessings and Importance of the Written Word of God, Serm.*, 110; ARTHUR ROBERTS, *The Uses of God's Word. Plain Sermons*, vol. i. 12; J. W. DONALDSON, *The Patience and Comfort of the Holy Scriptures*, A. WATSON, *2d Series* vol. i. 26; J. GARBETT, *Christ Speaking in Holy Scripture. Christ on Earth*, &c., vol. i. 30; BISHOP MEDLEY, *The Old Testament in its Relation to the New, Serm.*, 121; ISAAC WILLIAMS, *The Scriptures Bearing Witness, Serm.*, vol. i. 12.—J. F. H.]

SIXTH SECTION.—*Exhortation to unanimity on the part of all the members of the Church, to the praise of God and on the ground of God's grace, in which Christ has accepted both Jews and Gentiles. Reference to the destination of all nations to glorify God, even according to the Old Testament, and encouragement of the Roman Christians to an immeasurable hope in regard to this, according to their calling.*

CHAP. XV. 5–13.

5 Now the God of patience and consolation [comfort] grant you to be like-
minded [of the same mind] one toward another according to Christ Jesus:
6 That ye may with one mind *and* one mouth [with one accord ye may with one
mouth] glorify God, even the Father [*or*, the God and Father][1] of our Lord
7 Jesus Christ. Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received us
8 [you],[2] to the glory of God.[3] Now [For][4] I say that Jesus [*omit* Jesus][5]
Christ was [hath been made][6] a minister of the circumcision for the truth [for
the sake of God's truth] of God, to [in order to] confirm the promises *made*
9 unto the fathers: And that the Gentiles might glorify God for *his* mercy; as
it is written,

For this cause I will confess [give thanks] to thee among the Gentiles,
And sing unto thy name.

10, 11 And again he saith,[7] Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people. And again,[8]

Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles;
And laud[9] him, all ye people.

12 And again, Esaias [Isaiah] saith,[10]

There shall be a root of Jesse,
And he that shall rise [riseth] to reign over the Gentiles;
In him shall the Gentiles trust [hope].

13 Now [And may] the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace[11] in believing,
that ye may abound in hope, through [ἐν, in] the power of the Holy Ghost.

TEXTUAL

[1] Ver. 6.—[On the two renderings given above, see the *Exeg. Notes*.

[2] Ver. 7.—[The *Rec.*, with B. D[1]. : ἡμᾶς; ℵ. A. C. D[2] [3]. F. L., most versions and many fathers: ὑμᾶς. All modern editors adopt the latter. Besides the overwhelming MS. support, there is the additional reason, that ἡμᾶς might so readily enter as a correct gloss, since the reference is undoubtedly to both Jewish and Gentile Christians See the *Exeg. Notes*.

[3] Ver. 7.—[The *Rec.*, on very insufficient authority, omits τοῦ before Θεοῦ; inserted in ℵ. A. B. C. D. F. G.

[4] Ver. 8.—[Instead of γάρ, which is found in ℵ. A. B. C. D. F., versions and fathers, the *Rec.* (with L., and Peshito) reads: δέ. The latter reading probably arose from a misunderstanding of the connection (Alford), or because λέγω δέ is so common with Paul (Meyer). The former is now generally adopted (from Griesbach to Tregelles). Philippi thinks a decision impossible!

[5] Ver. 8.—[D. F., Syriac versions, *Rec.*, insert Ἰησοῦν before Χριστόν; some authorities (including Vulgate), after Χρ.; omitted in ℵ. A. B. C., fathers; rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, De Wette, Alford. The variation in position is decidedly against it, making an interpolation extremely probable. Dr. Lange thinks the connection favors the omission.

[6] Ver. 8.—[ℵ. A. C[2] D[3]. L., many fathers: γεγενῆσθαι; adopted by De Wette, Philippi, Meyer, Alford, Lange. B. C[1]. D[1]. F.: γενέσθαι, adopted by Lachmann and Tregelles. The former is to be preferred, because the γε- was likely to be omitted and the latter might have been substituted as a correction

[7] Ver 10.—[From the LXX., Deut. xxxii. 43. The Hebrew text is: הַרְנִינוּ גוֹיִם עַמּוֹ, literally, *Rejoice, O ye nations, His people.* It is not necessary, in order to defend the rendering of the LXX., to suppose that they read עִם עַמּוֹ or וְעַמּוֹ or אֶת־עַמּוֹ (although the last has been found). They could find the sense they have adopted in the Hebrew text as it stands, by simply repeating the imperative (in thought) before עַמּוֹ. See Philippi *in loco*, and Hengstenberg on Ps. xviii. 50.

[8] Ver. 11.—[B. D. F. read λέγει; omitted in ℵ. A. C. L., fathers. It was easily inserted from ver. 10. Lachmann adopts it, but it is generally rejected.—The order of the *Rec.*: τὸν κύριον πάντα τὰ ἔθνη is probably a correction to conform with the LXX. ℵ. A. B. D., Vulgate, Syriac, &c.: π. τ. ἔθ. τὸν κύριον. So Lachmann, Tischendorf Alford, Tregelles.

[9] Ver. 11.—[ℵ. A. B. C.: ἐπαινεσάτωσαν. So Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, De Wette, Alford, Tregelles, Lange. *Rec.*, F. L., versions: ἐπαινέσατε (so LXX., although the MSS. vary). Philippi adopts the latter, but he is a conservative as respects the *Recepta*.

[10] Ver. 12.—[The LXX. (Isa. xi. 10) is followed here. It differs somewhat from the Hebrew, which reads.

וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא שֹׁרֶשׁ יִשַׁי אֲשֶׁר עֹמֵד לְנֵס עַמִּים אֵלָיו גּוֹיִם יִדְרֹשׁוּ.

Literally: "*And in that day shall the root of Jesse which* (is) *standing* (or set up) *be for a signal to the nations; unto Him shall the Gentiles seek*" (J. A. Alexander). But the LXX. only strengthens this into a form well suited to the Apostle's purpose.

[11] Ver. 13.—[F. G. read: πληροφορήσαι ὑμᾶς πάσῃ χαρᾷ καὶ εἰρήνῃ. So B., inserting ἐν before the datives. ℵ. A. C D. L.: πληρώσαι ὑμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης; accepted by most editors.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The positive destination of the Christian Church at Rome.

Ver. 5. **Now the God of patience,** &c. [ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς, κ.τ.λ. "God, who is the author of patience," &c. So Hodge, Meyer, and most. Luther: "*Scriptura quidem docet, sed gratia donat, quod illa docet.*" Comp. Calvin on the patience of the Christian. De Wette, Meyer, and others, understand by ὑπομονή, *constancy*. Hodge takes *consolation* as the source of patience.—R.] God is the common, inexhaustible source of all the matured patience of the New Testament, and of all the preparatory comfort of the Old Testament; and it is from Him that believers must derive the gift of being of **the same mind one toward another according to Christ Jesus** (not according to His example and will merely, but according to His Spirit).*

Ver. 6. It is only in this path of self-humiliation that they shall and can attain to the glorious way of glorifying the God and Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*—Him who has glorified *Jesus as Christ*, after Christ passed through the *Jesus-way* of humiliation, and whom they glorify in the anticipation that He will glorify them with Him, as He has already glorified them in Him. The terms *Christ Jesus* and *Jesus Christ* are here reversed with remarkable acuteness and effect.—**With one accord,** ὁμοθυμαδόν, is not explained by the phrase: **with one mouth** [ἐν ἑνὶ στόματι], but the former is the source of the latter, as Meyer has correctly observed, against Reiche. ["When God is so praised that the same mood impels every one to the same utterance of praise, then party-feeling is banished, and unanimity has found its most sacred expression" (Meyer).—R.]

The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ [τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.] He is not only the Father, but also the God, of Christ, in the highest specific sense (thus Grotius [Bengel, Reiche, Fritzsche, Jowett], and others, in opposition to Meyer). Comp. Eph. i. 17.

[**God, even the Father,** &c. The E. V. thus renders, disconnecting "of our Lord Jesus Christ" from "God." So De Wette, Philippi, Meyer, Stuart Webster and Wilkinson. Hodge, Tholuck, and Alford, leave the question undecided. It would seem that either view is admissible grammatically; καί is often used epexegetically, *even*, and the article (standing before θεοῦ only) may merely bind the two terms, "God" and "Father of Christ" (Meyer). At the same time, the article *might* be looked for before πατέρα, were καί explicative. Nor is there any doctrinal difficulty occasioned by either view. The only reason in my own mind for preferring the interpretation of the E. V. is, that those exegetes, who are most delicate in their perceptions of grammatical questions, adopt it. See Meyer *in loco*.—R.]

Ver. 7. **Wherefore receive ye one another** [διὸ προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους]. In the intensive sense. An exhortation to both parties.

As Christ also received you [καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσελάβετο ὑμᾶς. See *Textual Note* [5].] This is more definitely explained in vers. 8 and 9.

To the glory of God [εἰς δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. See *Textual Note* [6].] This must be referred to Christ's reception of them, and not to the exhortation: *receive ye one another*, according to Chrysostom, and others.* *That God might be glorified.* Not *immediately*, in order that we may share the Divine glory with Christ (Grotius, Beza, and others), although the glorification of God shall consist in that. As the self-humiliation of Christ, which was proved by His receiving men into His fellowship, led to the glorification of God (see John xvii.), so also, according to the previous verse, shall the same conduct of self-humiliation on the part of Christians have the same effect. But how has Christ received us into His fellowship? Answer:

Ver. 8. **For I say** [λέγω γάρ. See *Textual Note* [4].] The Apostle now explains how Christ received the Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians into fellowship with himself.—**That Christ**

* [With this accords the view of Dr. Hodge: "The expression, *to be like-minded*, does not here refer to unanimity of opinion, but to harmony of feeling; see chaps. viii. 5; xii. 3." The context favors this very decidedly.—Meyer thinks "the example of Christ (ver. 3) is still the ruling thought;" but it is certainly not the exclusive one. The verb δῴη is the latter Hellenistic form for δοίη.—R.]

* [Dr. Hodge seems to prefer the other reference, while Dr. Lange really adopts both in his further remarks. Dr. Hodge does not decide which reading he adopts, ὑμᾶς or ἡμᾶς; but says that, if the former be the true reading, Paul is "exhorting the Gentile converts to forbearance toward their Jewish brethren." This view is rejected by most of the later commentators, for both parties are addressed, as the context shows. Because Paul often means Gentiles when he says ὑμεῖς, we need not hold that he always uses it in this sense.—R.]

[Χριστόν. See *Textual Note* [8].] The reading *Christ*, as a designation of God's Son, in view of the incarnation. In this view He **hath been made a minister of the circumcision** [διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς. See *Textual Note* [9]. Dr. Lange, in his German text of this verse, thus explains this phrase: "from a higher, Divine-human, ideal point of view, receiving the Jews into His fellowship, by submitting himself to circumcision."—R.] His concrete incarnation as a Jew, in which He became subject to the Jewish law (see Phil. ii. 7; Gal. iv. 4), must be distinguished from His incarnation in the more general sense. By this means, He, as the heavenly Strong One, through voluntary love entered into the fellowship of the infinitely weak in both a human and legal sense, and accordingly received them into His fellowship. It seems far-fetched to regard *the circumcision* here (with Meyer [Philippi, Hodge], and others) as an abstract idea for *the circumcised*.* The circumcision denotes the law; and as He freely became a minister of the law, He also became a ministering companion of the Jews; Matt. xx. 28. Therefore it is not the theocratic "honor of the Jews" which is emphasized here (Meyer) [Philippi], but the condescension to serve them. [So Hodge. Διάκονον is in emphatic position. The view of the emphasis taken by Meyer seems confirmed by what follows, which sets forth an advantage of the Jews.—R.]

For the sake of God's truth [ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας Θεοῦ. *For the sake of the truthfulness of God*, in order to justify and to prove it by means of the fulfilment of the promises of the Old Testament.—R.] This undoubtedly seems to express the advantage of the Jews; but it also indicates their perilous condition. His condescension had a twofold cause: God's mercy, and His promises resting upon it. Principially, His mercy took the precedence; but historically, the promise preceded. The truthfulness of God had to be sealed; He must confirm the promises given to the fathers by fulfilling them, however unfortunate the condition of the posterity; must confirm them in a way finally valid, for, as such sealed promises, they still continue in force, according to chap. xi., especially to believers (see 2 Cor. i. 20; Rev. iii. 14).

Ver. 9. **And that the Gentiles, &c.** [τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν Θεόν.] Christ had to receive the Jews, acting as a minister to them through His whole life; and He had to confine himself to historical labors among them, not so much because they were worthy of it, as to fulfil the promises given to the fathers. But the Gentiles were now the object of utterly unmerited mercy. The thought that Christ has redeemed the Gentiles through pure mercy, which was not yet historically pledged to them (for the promises in the Old Testament in relation to the Gentiles were not pledges to the Gentiles themselves), now passes immediately over into the representation of the fact that the Gentiles have already come to glorify God as believers, in which they have an advantage on their side also. The meaning of ὑπὲρ ἐλέους is, that mercy could not help satisfying itself for its own sake, by redemption. The δοξάσαι has been translated by Rückert [De Wette, Hodge, Alford], and others: *have glorified;* by Köllner [Calvin, Tholuck], and Philippi: *should glorify*. See Meyer on this point, p. 517.* The aorist says, at all events, that they have *decidedly begun* to glorify God.

For this cause I will give thanks to thee, &c. [Διὰ τοῦτο ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι, κ.τ.λ. Verbatim from the LXX., except that κύριε is omitted here. On the verb, see chap. xiv. 11, p. .—R.] Meyer aptly says: "The historical subject of the passage, *David*, is the type of *Christ*, and the latter (not the Gentile Christian, with Fritzsche; nor the collective term for the Gentile apostles, with Reiche; nor any messenger of salvation to the world, with Philippi) is therefore, in Paul's sense, the prophetical subject; Christ promises that He will glorify God among the Gentiles (surrounded by believing Gentiles) for His mercy (διὰ τοῦτο = ὑπὲρ ἐλέους). But this is the plastic description of glorifying on the part of the Gentiles themselves, which takes place in the name of the Lord Jesus, and through Him (Col. iii. 17)."

Ver. 10. **Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people** [Εὐφράνθητε ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ. See *Textual Note* [7], for the Hebrew text. —R.] Deut. xxxii. 43. From the LXX., which reads μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ for עַמּוֹ, "probably following another reading: אֶת־עַמּוֹ;" Meyer. On the impossibility of understanding, by Goim, the single tribes of Israel, which De Wette does, comp. Tholuck, p. 730. [Also Philippi, whose remarks on this citation are unusually full and valuable.—R.] According to the theocratic idea, the definitions: *rejoice to his people*, or rather, *make his people rejoice* (הַרְנִינוּ), *ye Gentiles*, and *rejoice with his people*, amount to the same thing.

Ver. 11. **Praise the Lord**; Ps. cxvii. 1. [An exact citation from the LXX. See *Textual Notes* [8] and [9], however.—R.] A prophecy of the universal spread of salvation.

Ver. 12. **And again, Isaiah saith.** [See *Textual Note* [10].] In chap. xi. 10: According to the LXX., which, however, has translated the original text so freely that the twofold dominion of the Messiah is indicated, on the one hand, over the Jews (as the root of Jesse), and, on the other, over the Gentiles.

A root of Jesse [ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαί]. See Isa. xi. 1. The tree of the royal house of David being cut down, the Messiah arose from the root of the house, which is symbolized by Jesse. In a higher sense, Christ was indeed the holy root of Jesse, and of the house of David itself.

* [This view can scarcely be deemed "far-fetched," when it is so readily suggested by the antithesis, ἔθνη (ver. 9), and when Paul so frequently uses the term in this sense (comp chap. iii. 20; Gal. ii. 7 ff.; Eph. ii. 11; Col. iii. 11).—R.]

* [The aorist infinitive δοξάσαι has occasioned some trouble among the grammarians.

1. It has been taken as dependent on λέγω (ver. 8). So Winer, p. 311, Hodge, Alford, De Wette, Philippi; but in different senses: (*a*.) I say that the Gentiles *have* praised God (at their conversion). So Alford, Hodge, De Wette. But this is both contrary to the usage with the aorist infinitive, and introduces a thought that does not seem to belong here naturally. (*b*.) I say that the Gentiles *ought to* praise God (Calvin, Philippi, Tholuck). But there is no idea of obligation introduced in ver. 8 which is parallel to this. (*c*.) I say that the Gentiles praise (indefinitely). So Winer, Fritzsche. But to this there are grammatical objections. Besides this, all these involve an incorrect view of the dependence of the infinitive.

2. The simplest, most natural view, is that of the E. V., Meyer, &c. The infinitive stands next to a clause where there is also an aorist infinitive (βεβαιῶσαι); it is therefore coördinate with this, depending also on εἰς τό, though expressing the more remote purpose: Christ was made a minister, &c., in order to confirm the promises, and as a result of this, that the Gentiles might praise God for His mercy.—R.]

Ver. 13. And may the God of hope. A grand description of God here, where the object is to remind the Roman Christians to lead a life in perfect accordance with their universal calling. To this also belongs the duty of looking confidently and prayerfully to the God of hope, the God of that future of salvation which is so infinitely rich, both extensively and intensively.

With all joy and peace. From that hope, the highest possible evangelical, saving joy, shall spring; the result of this shall be the richest measure of peace, and the harmony and unanimity of faith. This shall take place **in believing** (πιστεύειν, it is not by unbelief, or by abridging our faith, that the unity of Christianity should be sought), and accordingly these two spiritual blessings shall ever produce a richer hope, not in human power and according to a human measure, but **in the** inward measure and divine **power of the Holy Ghost.***

Therefore the realization of hope should not be striven for by the aid of earthly and even infernal powers: one shepherd and one fold! According to Grotius, the end of this hope is harmony; according to Tholuck, the immediate end is the gracious gifts of God's kingdom; while the ultimate end is the *regnum gloriæ*. However, there lies just between these the end which the Apostle here has in view—that by the aid of the Church at Rome, in their fellowship with Paul, all nations shall be brought, by the spread of faith, to glorify God; Eph. i. 18 ff.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The great grounds of the profound and perfect harmony and unanimity of Christians. *a.* God as the God of patience and comfort; that is, as the God of the infinite power of passive and active love; *b.* The pattern, the spirit, the power, and the work of Christ; *c.* The design that Christians, by being like-minded, and by aiming at *substantial* fellowship in God and in Christ (as created and redeemed), should find also the *ethical* fellowship of harmony and unanimity.

2. The universal fellowship into which Christ has entered with humanity, and the special fellowship in which He has pledged himself to the Jews, constitute the basis for the most special and real fellowship into which He, through His grace, has entered with believers. But it is a grievous offence to refuse communion with him whom Christ, by the witness of faith and of confession, has communion, or to abridge and prejudice hearty intercourse with those whom God, in Christ, deems worthy of His fellowship. [Ver. 7 seems to be a *dictum probans* for what is termed "open communion."—R.]

3. On the antithesis: *Christ Jesus* and *Jesus Christ*, see the *Exeg. Notes*.

4. It is also clear here (see ver. 8) that we must distinguish between the *ideal* incarnation of Christ in itself, and His concrete incarnation in Judaism, and, generally, in the form of a servant.

5. God is free in His grace, and yet also bound in His truth, for He has bound himself to His promises. But this obligation is the highest glory of His freedom. His truthfulness had to satisfy His word, but His mercy had to satisfy itself.

6. The riches of the Old Testament in promises for the Jews, and the high aim of these promises: a world of nations praising the Lord.

7. The God of *patience*, *comfort*, *hope*. All such terms define God to be infinite, and infinite as a fountain, as self-communicating life, and archetype of life. So also is the Holy Spirit defined as the Spirit of truth, &c. See the beautiful remark of Gerlach, below. But the highest thing for which we can praise God, according to ver. 6, is His being the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Not only is He His Father in the specific sense, but also His God; the glorious God of His consciousness and life is the true God in perfect revelation, and consequently shall become our God through Him.

8. On the development of hope, within the sphere of faith, into joy and peace, and, by means of peace, into an ever richer hope, see the *Exeg. Notes*. It is only in this way that irenics can be conducted in the power of the Holy Ghost, and not with the modern artifice of attempting them outside the sphere of faith, beyond all creeds, and with the theory of unconscious Christianity, or even with the violent measures of the Middle Ages. The Apostle says: *In the power of the Holy Ghost.*

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Jewish and Gentile Christians should agree for Christ's sake, who has received them both.—Christian harmony. 1. It comes from the God of patience and comfort; 2. It is shaped according to the pattern and will of Jesus Christ; 3. It expresses itself in harmonious praise of God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (vers. 5, 6).—A harmonious and fraternal disposition is a source of the joyous praise of God, which is not disturbed by a discordant note (vers. 5, 6).—Jesus Christ a minister of the circumcision. 1. Why? For the truth of God, to confirm the promise. 2. How? In obedience to the Divine law, for freedom from the law (ver. 8).—Receive one another, as Christ also received us, to the glory of God. Every thing to God's glory, and not to our own (ver. 7).—The praise of God out of the mouth of Gentiles: 1. Established in God's mercy; 2. Resounding in many tongues; 3. Ascending to heaven (ver. 9).—God's mercy toward the Gentiles: 1. Present from the beginning; 2. Declared by the prophets; 3. Manifested in Christ (vers. 9–13). Ver. 13 is an appropriate text and theme for addresses on occasions of confirmation or marriage.

STARKE: In Christ, souls are worth so much that God receives them, just as men hoard gold and silver, pearls and gems; Isa. xliii. 4 (ver. 7).—MÜLLER: Patience does not increase in the garden of nature, but it is God's gift and grace; God is the real Master who creates it (ver. 5).—Because Christ is a root, He must vegetate, bloom, and bring forth fruit in us (ver. 12).

GERLACH: God is the source of all good things

* [Meyer renders: *in virtue of the* (inworking) *power* of the *Holy Ghost*. Our E. V., usually so apt, is peculiarly unfortunate in its treatment of the preposition ἐν, which it renders *through* in this case. The later revisions have *by*. But it is to be doubted whether ἐν ever has a strictly instrumental force. The peculiar meaning, *in*, always remains in it. So here, *in believing, in the power of the Holy Ghost*; the former expressing the *subjective*, and the latter, the *objective* means, yet the former sets forth the status, *in which* (*gläubigsein*) they are, and the latter an *inworking* power. Comp. Philippi.—R.]

and since He not merely has them, but they are His real essence; since He does not have love and omnipotence, but *is* actually love and omnipotence themselves, so can He be denominated according to every glorious attribute and gift which He possesses. The advantage which the Gentiles thought that they possessed in their polytheism, when they, for example, worshipped a deity of truth, of hope, &c., is possessed in a much more certain and effective way by the believing Christian, when he perceives, in a vital manner, that the true God is himself personal faithfulness, hope, and love, and thus has all these attributes just as if He had nothing else but them (ver. 5).

HEUBNER: The harmony of hearts is the real soul and power of worship (ver. 6).—Christ is the centre of the Holy Scriptures (ver. 8).—Christ is the bond of all nations (ver. 12).—God alone is the *source* of all life and blessing in the Church. The means is faith, as the ever new appropriation of saving blessings; from this arises the enjoyment of peace and of all blessed joys—an overflow of hope. But every thing is brought to pass by the Holy Spirit (ver. 13).

BESSER: The Scriptures are a book of patience and comfort (ver. 5.)—Every thing which is true *joy* in this life, is a foretaste of the joy of eternal life—joy in the Lord and His word, joy in all His blessings, which make body and soul happy, &c. . . . All true peace in this world of contention and anxiety, is a preliminary enjoyment of the peace in the kingdom of glory.

SCHLEIERMACHER: The limitation in the labors of our Saviour himself, when we look at His person, and the greater freedom and expansion in the labors of His disciples. 1. Treatment; 2. Application (vers. 8, 9).

Vers. 4–13. THE PERICOPE *for the Second Sunday in Advent*.—SCHULTZ: On the likeness of Christ and His redeemed ones. 1. In what respect has Christ become like us? 2. In what respect should we become like Christ? *a.* In patience and humility; *b.* In the respect and love with which He treated all men; *c.* In the joyful faith and peaceful hope with which He overcame the world.—RIEMER: What must there be among Christians, in order that the Church of Christ may stand? 1. One foundation; 2. A harmonious mouth; 3. A common bond.—BRANDT: To what does the season of Advent exhort us? 1. To the industrious examination of what has been written; 2. To the unanimous praise of God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, for all that has been already fulfilled; 3. To an attentive waiting for the future coming of God's kingdom.—HEUBNER: The unity of the Christian Church. 1. In what does it consist? 2. What binds us to it?—The Bible the bond of the Christian Church. 1. Proof: It is the bond, *a.* In faith, or in doctrine; *b.* In the holy sense, or in love; *c.* In worship; *d.* In daily life. 2. Application. *a.* A warning against despising the Bible, and an admonition to maintain its authority; *b.* A dissemination of its use; *c.* Our own proper use of it.—The Bible the treasure of the evangelical Church.—The inward unity of true Christians amid outward diversity.

[BURKITT: The Christian's hope: 1. God is its object, and therefore the sin of despair is most unreasonable; for why should any despair of His mercy who is the God of hope, who commands us to hope in His mercy, and takes pleasure in them that do so? 2. The grace of hope, together with joy and peace in believing, are rooted in the Christian's heart, through the power of the Holy Ghost—that is, through the sanctifying influences of the Holy Ghost—enlightening the understanding, inclining the will, rectifying the affections, and reducing all the rebellious powers and faculties of the soul in concurrence with our endeavors under the government and dominion of reason and religion.

[HENRY: The method of faith is: 1. To seek Christ as one proposed to us for a Saviour; 2. And, finding Him able and willing to save, then to trust in Him. They that know Him will trust in Him. Or, this seeking Him is the effect of a trust in Him, seeking Him by prayer and pursuant endeavors. Trust, is the mother; diligence in the use of means, the daughter.—What is laid *out* upon Christians is but little compared with what is laid *up* for them.—DODDRIDGE: Nothing can furnish so calm a peace and so sublime a joy as Christian hope.—That is the most happy and glorious circumstance in the station which Providence may have assigned us, which gives us the greatest opportunity of spreading the honor of so dear a name, and of presenting praises and services to God through Him.

KOLLOCK, *Sermon on the patience of God*. I. The nature of this patience, or slowness to anger (1.) It is a modification of the Divine goodness; (2.) It is not the result of ignorance; (3.) It is not the result of impotence; (4.) It is not the result of a connivance at sin, or a resolution to suffer it with impunity; (5.) But it is grounded on the everlasting covenant, and the blood of Jesus. II. Some of the most illustrious manifestations of it. III. The reasons why God exercises it: (1.) He is patient because of His benignity; (2.) In order that this perfection may be glorified; (3). In consequence of the prayers of pious ancestors; (4.) Because the wicked are often mixed with the pious, and nearly related to them; (5.) The number of His elect is not yet completed; (6.) The measure of the sins of the wicked is not yet filled up; (7.) That sinners may be brought to repentance; (8.) That sinners who continue impenitent may at last be without excuse; (9.) That His power may be displayed; (10.) That He may exercise the trust of His servants in Him. IV. The effects that the belief and knowledge of it should produce upon our hearts and lives: (1.) Because of God's patience we should love Him; (2.) We should repent; (3.) We should imitate Him; (4.) His patience should be our comfort; (5.) We should grieve at the reproaches and insults cast upon God.

[HOMILETICAL LITERATURE *on ver.* 13: HUGH BINNING, *Works*, vol. iii. 249; R. LUCAS, *Joy, Peace, and Hope, the Christian's Portion Here*, *Serm.* (1709), vol. ii. 119; BISHOP MOORE, *Excellency of the Christian Religion*, *Serm.*, vol. ii. 291; JAMES CRAIG, *Serm.*, vol. ii. 355; J. DODSON, *Joy in Believing*, *Disc.*, 184; DANIEL DE SUPERVILLE (*le fils*), *Les Fruits consolans de la Foi*, *Serm.*, vol. iii. 328 R. MOSS, *Nature and Qualification of Christian Hope*, *Serm.*, vol. vi. 325; PRICE, *Peace of Conscience, Hope, and Holy Joy*, *Berry St. SS.*, vol. i. 419; S. OGDEN, *The Being of the Holy Ghost*, *Serm.*, 157; W. MASON, *The Effects of the Divine Spirit*, *Works*, vol. iv. 147; H. HUNTER, *The Belief of the Gospel a Source of Joy and Peace*, *Serm* (1795), vol. i. 227; DAVID SAVILE, *Present Happiness of Believers*, *Disc.*, 401; W. GILPIN, *Sermons*, 165; C. SIMEON, *The Holy Ghost the Author of Hope*, *Works*, vol. xv. 553; G. D'OYLY, *Joy and*

Peace in Believing, vol. i. 385; W. BLACKLEY, *Script. Teaching*, 268; W. GRESLEY, *Joy and Peace in Believing, Practical Serm.*, 41; E. BLENCOWE, *Hope, Plain Serm.*, vol. ii. 80; H. GOODWIN, *The Young Man in Religious Difficulties, Four Serm* 35.—J. F. K.]

SECOND DIVISION.

THE CALLING OF THE APOSTLE TO A UNIVERSAL APOSTLESHIP, AND HIS CONSEQUENT RELATION TO THE ROMAN CHURCH, AS THE POINT OF DEPARTURE FOR HIS UNIVERSAL APOSTLESHIP IN THE WEST.

CHAP. XV. 14-33.

14 And I myself also am persuaded of you, my brethren, [Now I am persuaded,
my brethren, even I myself, concerning you,] that ye also [yourselves] are full
of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another.
15 Nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly unto you [Howbeit, I
have written more boldly[2] unto you, brethren][3] in some sort [measure], as put-
16 ting you in mind, because of the grace that is given to me of God, That I
should be the [a] minister of Jesus Christ [Christ Jesus][4] to the Gentiles, min-
istering the gospel of God, that the offering up [offering] of the Gentiles might
17 be acceptable, being sanctified by [ἐν, in] the Holy Ghost. I have therefore
whereof I may glory [I have therefore my boasting][5] through Jesus Christ [in
18 Christ Jesus] in those things which pertain to God.[6] For I will not dare to
speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought [did not work] by
[through] me, to make the Gentiles obedient [in order to the obedience of the
19 Gentiles], by word and deed, Through mighty [In the power of] signs and
wonders, by [in] the power of the Spirit of God [Holy Spirit];[7] so that from
Jerusalem, and round about unto [as far as] Illyricum, I have fully preached the
20 gospel of Christ. [;] Yea, so have I strived [Yet on this wise making it my
ambition][8] to preach the gospel, not where Christ was [already] named, lest I
21 should [that I might not] build upon another man's foundation: But as it is
written,[9]

To whom he was not spoken of, they [They to whom no tidings of him came] shall see:
And they that have not heard shall understand.

22 For which cause also I have been much [for the most part][10] hindered from
23 coming to you. But now having no more [no more having] place in these parts,
and having a great desire these many years [having these many years a longing]
24 to come unto you; Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to
you [*omit* I will come to you]:[11] for[12] I trust to see you in my journey [as I
pass through], and to be brought on my way thitherward [to be sent forward
thither] by[13] you, if first I be somewhat [in some measure] filled with your
company.
25 But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister [ministering] unto the saints.
26 For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia [Macedonia and Achaia
thought it good] to make a certain contribution for the poor [among the] saints
27 which are at Jerusalem. It hath pleased them verily [For they thought it
good]; and their debtors they are. For if the Gentiles have been made par-
takers of [have shared in] their spiritual things, their duty is [they owe it] also
28 to minister unto them in carnal things. When therefore I have performed this,
and have sealed [*i. e.*, secured] to them this fruit, I will come [return][14] by you
29 [through your city] unto Spain. And I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall

come in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel [*omit* of the gospel][15] of
30 Christ. Now I beseech you, brethren,[16] for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake [by
our Lord Jesus Christ], and for [by] the love of the Spirit, that ye [to] strive
31 together with me in *your*[17] prayers to God for me; That I may be delivered
from them that do not believe [the disobedient] in Judea; and that my service
[ministration][18] which *I have* [is] for Jerusalem may be accepted of [prove
32 acceptable to] the saints; That I may come unto you with [in] joy by the will
33 of God,[19] and may with you be refreshed.[20] Now the God of peace *be* with
you all. Amen.[21]

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 14.—[Instead of ἀλλήλους (ℵ. A. B. C. D. F.), adopted by modern editors generally, ἄλλους is found in L., many cursives, versions, and fathers. As an alteration to strengthen the sense, or an error of the transcriber, it is readily accounted for. The list of cursives given by Dr. Hodge adds little to the support of this reading.—The καί is also omitted, and ἀλλήλους put before δυνάμενοι, in some authorities. These are evidently corrections, to avoid repeating καί for the third time.

[2] Ver 15.—[A. B.: τολμηροτέρως. Evidently a gloss, since the adjective is used adverbially.

[3] Ver. 15.—[ℵ[1]. A. B. C., omit ἀδελφοί; rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles. It is found in ℵ[3]. D. F. L., Vulgate, &c.; adopted by Philippi, De Wette, Meyer, Lange; bracketted by Alford. The omission can be accounted for by the interruption the word made in the connection, while there is no good reason for its insertion, save its genuineness.

[4] Ver. 16.—[*Rec.*, D. L., some versions and fathers: Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ℵ. A. B. C. F.: Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ; so Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Tregelles.—The same order is found in ver. 17, on the authority of all MSS., but the E. V. has transposed, as it too frequently does.

[5] Ver. 17.—[B. C. D. F. G., and some cursives: τὴν καύχησιν; so Lachmann, Tischendorf, De Wette, Alford, Tregelles, Lange. Omitted in the *Rec.*, ℵ. A. L., by Philippi. The article not being understood, it was omitted.—Hence *my boasting*.

[6] Ver. 17.—[The *Rec.* omits τόν; but the MSS. all insert it.

[7] Ver. 19.—[(1.) The *Rec.* (with ℵ. D[3]. L.) inserts Θεοῦ after πνεύματος. So most cursives, some versions, and fathers. But it is defended by no critical editor of the present day. Philippi, who is perhaps the most conservative of critics, with respect to the *Recepta*, only places this reading beside the one mentioned next. (2.) A. C. D[1 3]. F., most versions and fathers: πνεύματος ἁγίου. So Griesbach, Lachmann, Scholz, Tischendorf (ed. 1, not since), Hodge, Philippi, De Wette, Wordsworth, Tregelles. (3.) B., Pelagius, have πνεύματος only. So Tischendorf, Meyer, and Lange. The reason urged in favor of (3.), which has so little MS. support, is the difficulty of accounting for it otherwise, and the strong temptation to explain it by ἁγίου or Θεοῦ. But this is hardly a sufficient reason. Tregelles, the most careful of English editors, especially about inserting the longer of two readings, adopts (2.), and Alford puts it in brackets.

[8] Ver. 20.—[ℵ. A. C. D[2 3]. L.: φιλοτιμούμενον. B. D[1]. F. (Lachmann, Tregelles): φιλοτιμοῦμαι. There are other variations, all of which indicate that the original reading was one occasioning grammatical difficulty. Hence the first reading is generally adopted, and the other considered a grammatical correction.—The E. V. requires emendation, both on account of the particip al form, connecting this verse with the preceding one, and in order to bring out the force of φιλοτ. The revision of Five Ang. Clergymen is followed. *Emulous* (Amer. Bible Union) is objectionable in a popular version. Dr. Lange: *So aber, dass ich es für Ehrensache halte; But so, that I held it for a matter of honor.* This gives the exact force of the verb. See the *Exeg. Notes.*

[9] Ver. 21.—[An exact citation from the LXX., Isa. lii. 15. The Hebrew reads: כִּי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־סֻפַּר לָהֶם רָאוּ וַאֲשֶׁר לֹא־שָׁמְעוּ הִתְבּוֹנָנוּ. The E. V. (Isa. lii. 15) gives an accurate rendering. The LXX. adds, with sufficient ground in the context: περὶ αὐτοῦ, referring to "my servant" (ver. 13).

[10] Ver. 22.—[B. D. F., Lachmann: πολλάκις, which is probably a gloss. ℵ. A. C. L.: τὰ πολλά. So Tischendorf, Philippi, Meyer, De Wette, Alford, Tregelles.

[11] Ver. 24.—[*Rec.*, with ℵ[3]. L., inserts ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Omitted in ℵ[1]. A. B. C. D. F., many versions and fathers; rejected by Griesbach, Lachmann, Meyer, Philippi, Alford, Tregelles. Tischendorf has adopted this reading in ed. 2; De Wette prefers it; Lange adopts it. It is better to reject, since, on many accounts, it is the less difficult reading, and likely to be added.—The real critical difficulty lies in the question respecting γάρ (see *note* [12]).

[12] Ver. 24.—[ℵ. A. B. C. D. L. insert γάρ. Omitted in F., versions and fathers. The minor authorities for the omission are much the same as in the case of the preceding variation (hence Dr. Hodge says most of these authorities omit γάρ); but the MS. authority is as decidedly in favor of γάρ as it is against ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς. The editors differ: Griesbach and his followers, Philippi, Hodge (apparently), Meyer, reject it; Lachmann, Tischendorf, De Wette, Alford, Wordsworth, Tregelles, Lange, retain it. Meyer thinks its presence in the early uncial shows, not that the whole disputed passage was original, but early inserted, and then partially corrected, thus leaving γάρ. This is very improbable, since this reading is so difficult; besides, there is no evidence whatever supporting it. Many, for convenience sake, reject γάρ. Lachmann puts from ἐλπίζω to ἐμπλησθῶ in parenthesis, connecting closely with ver. 25; but this connection is unlikely.—The reader can consult Meyer, Philippi, and critical editors, on the whole question. A careful consideration of the case impels me to retain γάρ, putting a period or colon (as in E. V.) after Σπανίαν; to accept an anacoluthon, or aposiopesis, and to take the participles of ver. 23 as verbs. This is the most defensible position, but further reasons cannot be added here. See the paraphrase in the *Exeg. Notes.*

[13] Ver. 24.—[*Rec.*, with ℵ. A. C. L.: ὑφ' ὑμῶν; B. (ἀπὸ) D. F.: ἀφ' ὑμῶν. The former is adopted by Philippi, Tregelles; the latter by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, De Wette, Alford, Lange.

[14] Ver. 28.—[Ἀπελεύσομαι, *I will proceed*, with a primary reference to the point of departure (ἀπό), but followed by εἰς, it points to the *terminus ad quem*. Neither *come* (E. V.) nor *go* (Amer. Bible Union) exactly meets the case. *Return*, in this case, is peculiarly appropriate; return from Jerusalem and go to Spain. So Five Ang. Clergymen.—The labors of the learned authors have been freely used in this section.

[15] Ver. 29.—[The words τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ (inserted before Χριστοῦ, in ℵ[3]. L. *Rec.*, versions and fathers) are now considered a gloss. They are not found in ℵ[1]. A. B. C. D. F., are rejected by the Latin fathers, and by all modern critical editors, also Philippi and Hodge, who are least disposed to vary from the *Recepta*.

[16] Ver. 30.—[B. omits ἀδελφοί, and the variations in position are numerous. Alford accordingly brackets it; but it is received by most editors without question.

[17] Ver. 30.—[D. F. G. insert ὑμῶν (similarly some editions of the Vulgate). A correct gloss, hence the more suspicious.

[18] Ver. 31.—[B. D[1]. F. G. read δωροφορία. But ℵ. A. C. D[2 3]. L., most versions favor διακονία, which is adopted by most later editors. So Tischendorf, Meyer, Philippi, Tregelles. Lachmann prefers the former, which, however, seems to have been substituted as an explanation.—On the same authority, ἡ εἰς Ἰερ. is to be preferred to ἡ ἐν Ἰ (Lachmann).

[19] Ver. 32.—[Instead of the well-sustained and generally received Θεοῦ (*Rec.* ℵ[3]. A. C. D[3]. L., most versions and fathers), we find κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (B.), Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (D[1]. F.), Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (ℵ[1].). The uncial authority is decisive. Besides, Paul always says: θέλημα Θεοῦ, never Χριστοῦ (so Meyer, and others).

[30] Ver. 32.—[Lachmann and Tischendorf omit καὶ συναναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν, on the authority of B. The words are found (with variations) in (א.) A. C. (D. F.) L., and are adopted by Meyer, De Wette, Philippi, Tregelles Alford brackets. Notwithstanding the variations, there is no motive for insertion which would justify us in rejecting the clause.

[31] Ver. 33.—[A. F. G. omit Ἀμήν; found in א. B. C. D. L., versions and fathers. Bracketted by Tregelles, but generally received. The word is always open to some suspicion, as a liturgical addition, at the close of a benediction —R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The following section is termed an *Epilogue* by Tholuck and Meyer. But this view does not correspond with the purpose and construction of the Epistle. The Apostle now comes to the last design of his Epistle, which is, to make Rome the principal station for his missionary labors in the West. See Schott, *Der Römerbrief*, p. 314, and elsewhere.

Summary.—A. The Apostle explains, almost apologetically, that his addressing the Romans was the result of his call to make the Gentiles, in priestly labor, an acceptable offering to God; and he gives information respecting the general completion of his work in the East (to Illyricum), and the results of the same; vers. 14–19.

B. *His principle*, not to invade the sphere of the labor of others (conduct the very opposite of that of all sectaries). The consequent impediments to his coming to Rome, where Christian congregations already exist. The desire, that nevertheless arose in harmony with his calling, to take this step. His hesitation not being fully removed, he describes his intended visit to Rome as a sojourn to gain strength for his further journey to Spain—that is, to the limits of the West; doubtless in the expectation that the Church will welcome him, and commit itself to his direction; vers. 20–24.

C. The last hindrance from his journey to Rome. The mention of the collections a proof of his love for believing Israelites, an expression of the proper conduct of Gentile Christians toward Jewish Christians. A further announcement of his journey through Rome, and of his visit, in the spirit of apostolical refinement. A *foreboding* reference to the obstructing hostility of the unbelievers in Judea, and a request that the Roman Christians should pray for the fulfilment of his purpose of coming to them; vers. 25–33.

A. Vers. 14–19.—Ver. 14. **Even I myself**; αὐτὸς ἐγώ, chap. vii. 25. He himself, *the same*, who has admonished them, has also this conviction. Thus he is not in antithesis to *others* (Tholuck),* but he, *as the one persuaded*, is in antithesis to *his admonition*. This is favored by the following verse. Fritzsche, De Wette, Philippi [Stuart, Alford], explain similarly.

[**Ye also yourselves**, καὶ αὐτοί. "Without any exhortation of mine" (Alford).—R.]—**Are full of goodness** [μεστοί ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης]. In the foregoing section the ἀγαθόν was to be understood particularly of humility and self-denying love, as the key-note of Christ's feeling; accordingly, it must also here be construed as a substantive. (Meyer: "That ye are also of yourselves very excellent people.") [Hodge: "Full of kind and conciliatory feelings; or, taking ἀγαθωσύνη in its wider sense, full of virtue, or excellence." This last is adopted, apparently, from Meyer; it is so wide as to seem almost too complimentary.—R.]

With all knowledge [Γνώσεως. We reject the article, which is found only in א. B.—R.] The Apostle very willingly refers the γνῶσις particularly to the universal destination of Christianity; comp. Eph. i.—**Admonish**, νουθετεῖν. Strictly, to direct with brotherly feeling. To set the heart right is not a human affair; but when the heart is properly disposed, the νοῦς (or even the head) can be placed right.

Ver. 15. [**Howbeit I have written more boldly unto you**, τολμηρότερον δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν]. The adjective is used adverbially. Meyer insists upon the comparative sense. [The verb ἔγραψα is the epistolary aorist, *I have written*; hence the Amer. Bible Union, *I wrote*, is a slavish following of the rule which makes the Greek aorist equivalent to the English past tense. The authors of that version unfortunately ignore all exceptions. —**Brethren**, ἀδελφοί. See *Textual Note* ³.—**In some measure**, ἀπὸ μέρους. This qualifies ἔγραψα: *I have written boldly in places* (so De Wette, Meyer, Lange); not the adverb: *I have written somewhat too boldly* (Peshito, Grotius, Hodge). Hence the E. V. does not convey the meaning correctly.—R.] The boldness consists in his having spoken to them as to his own church, although he is not, strictly speaking, its founder, and refers, for the most part, to chap. xiv. ff. Meyer enumerates, in preference, a number of other passages: chap. vi. 12 ff., &c. [viii. 9; xi. 17 ff.; xii. 3; xiii. 3 ff.; xiv. 3 f. 10, 13, 15, 20; xv. 1.—R.]

As putting you in mind. He can say this in a general sense of the Christian state of development, which he presupposes in them, and, in a special sense, with reference to his many friends in Rome, who were not only his disciples, but also his helpers.

Because of the grace, &c. [διὰ τὴν χάριν, κ.τ.λ.] The following verse explains the sense in which he means this. Because his great and gracious call impels him to go far beyond Rome, he must first of all arrange matters perfectly with them. [The common interpretation: "My apostolic office was the ground and reason of my boldness," does not exclude the special reference suggested by Dr. Lange.—R.]

Ver. 16. **That I should be a minister** [εἰς τὸ εἶναί με λειτουργόν. The purpose of the grace given to him.—R.] The λειτουργός denotes, not only according to the immediate connection, but also according to the character of the whole Epistle, the minister in public worship; Meyer: the *sacrificing priest*; Heb. viii. 2; Phil. ii. 17.

Christ Jesus [Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. This reading seems most accordant with the context, since the priestly service under Christ, *the King*, is referred to.—R.] Reiche: Christ is the offering brought; Rückert, very properly, says: Christ is the *High-Priest*; against which Meyer strangely

* [Meyer (followed by Hodge in last edition) understands it to mean: "I of myself, without the testimony of others." He urges the emphasis which he thinks rests on καὶ αὐτός. Were the meaning that suggested by Dr. Lange, the form would be κἀγὼ αὐτός. But the view of Dr. Lange corresponds best with that taken of the same expression, pp. 243, 244. Hence we alter "I myself also" into *even I myself* (so Five Ang. Clergymen). Lange: *Ich auch als einer und derselbe.*—R.]

urges, that this is not an idea of Paul, but of the Epistle to the Hebrews. [De Wette, Meyer, Fritzsche, and Philippi, think that Christ is represented here as Head and King of the Church, which is perhaps preferable.—R.]

Ministering (as a priest in) the gospel of God [ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Performing a priestly office with reference to the gospel.—R.] Explanations: 1. The gospel is the offering (Luther). 2. The office of the gospel is his priestly office (Erasmus, Tholuck, &c.). As the law was the basis of the Old Testament *cultus*, so the gospel is the basis of the New Testament *cultus*. Hence the meaning is: Explaining, as ministrant to the High-Priest, Christ, the gospel in its liturgical character, and transforming the knowledge of God contained in the gospel into evangelical praise of God (thank-offering); see chap. i. 21. [A slight modification is necessary, if Christ be represented here as King. Estius: "*Administrans evangelium a Deo missum hominibus, eoque ministerio velut sacerdotio fungens.*"—R.]

The offering of the Gentiles [ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν. Genitive of apposition.] Not the offering which the Gentiles bring, but which the Gentiles themselves are (burnt-offerings).

Being sanctified in the Holy Ghost [ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Ἐν seems to be instrumental, and yet may well indicate the element in which they were sanctified, purified.—R.] In the real New Testament mode, not in the merely typical sense of the consecration in the temple.*

Ver. 17. **I have therefore my boasting in Christ Jesus** [ἔχω οὖν τὴν καύχησιν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. See *Textual Note* [6].] We take ἔχω as emphatic, and in connection with the words *Christ Jesus*. His glorying (the act itself) in his great calling, he, as the minister of Christ, holds within the bounds of the fellowship and Spirit of Christ. [He incidentally opposes any suspicion of his glorying himself, but the main emphasis does not rest on this. De Wette, Alford: "I venture to boast." *In*, not *through* Christ (E. V., Stuart).—R.]

In those things which pertain to God [τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν]. According to the context, the restoration of the real worship of God in the world is meant. [Philippi, De Wette, Alford: "My above-named sacerdotal office and ministry."—R.] Meyer says, however: "My boasting is something which belongs to me in virtue of my connection with Christ, in relation to God's cause." Reiche: My glorying consists in my glorying of Christ. [Dr. Hodge mentions another: "I have offerings for God—*i. e.*, Gentile converts." Too far-fetched.—R.]

Ver. 18. **For I will not dare, &c.** [οὐ γὰρ τολμήσω, κ.τ.λ.]. The γάρ explains how he meant the foregoing expression in ver. 17. But ver. 17 refers to ver. 16, in proof that he knows that he is placed, as a minister, completely under the direction and operation of the Spirit of Christ, the High-Priest. Thus Paul speaks, and thus John speaks; but modern criticism, on the other hand, boldly maintains the contrary—that Paul corrected the Ebionitic form of Christ, and that then ("pseudo") John again corrected Paulinism.—The constant purpose was to call the Gentiles to the obedience of faith. Tholuck, and others, here accept a reference to the experiences which Paul had suffered in Corinth from the Judaists. But his purpose is, to show to the Romans that he comes to them simply as an instrument of Christ.

[The emphasis rests on οὐ κατειργάσατο, **did not work.** Hodge, following Theodoret, and others, places it on *Christ*, so that the antithesis is what he did, or could do, of himself. But the view taken of the verse by most commentators will appear from Alford's paraphrase: "I have *real* ground for glorying (in a legitimate and Christian manner); *for I will not* (as some false apostles do) *allow myself to speak of any of those things which* (ὧν for ἐκείνων, ἅ) *Christ did* NOT *work by me* (but by some other) *in order to the obedience* (subjection to the gospel) *of the Gentiles* (then, as if the sentence were in the affirmative form, 'I will only boast of what Christ has veritably done *by me* toward the obedience of the Gentiles,' he proceeds) *by word and deed.*" This last phrase is to be joined with ver. 19.—R.]

Ver. 19. **In the power of signs and wonders** [ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων]. Thus the ἔργον of Paul is explained. Comp. the Acts of the Apostles.—But he refers every thing, word and work, signs and wonders, in a more special sense (in signs the miracle refers to the coming renewed world, and in τέρας to the astonishment of the old world) to the power of the Spirit, the spiritual life in which the Holy Spirit has become one with his spirit.* These "wonders" are incidentally a confirmation of the accounts of similar import in the Acts of the Apostles, and are therefore very uncomfortable to Baur, and others; comp. 2 Cor. xii. 12.

From Jerusalem. After the intensiveness of his labors, he comes to their extensiveness. Three points must be here observed: (1.) From Jerusalem; (2.) κύκλῳ; (3.) To Illyricum. As for (1.), the Apostle has reckoned his stay in Arabia and Damascus among his years of instruction, and not among his years as teacher. Likewise Jerusalem, where he first entered upon his apostolical labors, was not only the starting-point of the mission of all the apostles, but especially of his (see Acts ix. 28, 29; xxii. 18.)

Round about [καὶ κύκλῳ]. This does not mean in an *arc* (from Jerusalem by way of Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece, to Illyricum; Theodoret, Flacius, and others), but round about;† in which, indeed, points forming a circle come into consideration, though the expression must not be pressed geographically.

As far as Illyricum [μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ]. The later expositors generally regard Illyricum as the terminus (see Tholuck); but Meyer, on the contrary, is of the opinion that this view subjects the Apostle to the suspicion of boasting; and

* [This verse, instead of supporting the idea that the Christian ministry is a priesthood, virtually opposes it. Had the Apostle laid claim to actual and special sacerdotal functions, it is very unlikely that he would have kept the claim so constantly out of sight in his Epistles. In this passage, the offering is a figurative one, the priestly function is also figurative. The silence of the rest of his writings of itself proves that this must be regarded in another than a literal sense. See *Doctr. Note* [4].—R.]

* [Should πνεύματος be accepted as the correct reading, then, of course, πνεῦμα may be taken in the second sense (see p. 235); yet this is not absolutely necessary since Meyer rejects the longer reading and at the same time refers πνεύματος to the Holy Spirit. But the reading πνεύματος ἁγίου is more probably correct; see *Textual Note* [7].—R.]

† [De Wette, Philippi, Alford, and others, join this with "Jerusalem," taking it as = *and the neighborhood*. It does seem to be connected with the starting-point, and yet Dr Lange rightly includes the intermediate journeyings, &c —R.]

probably, therefore, that he made an excursion into Illyricum, "possibly to the journey narrated in Acts xx. 1–3." But μέχρι θαλάσσης means to the sea, not into the sea. In Acts xx. 1–3 there is no trace of a journey by way of Macedonia and Greece to the West.

I have fully preached, πεπληρωκέναι. [Literally: *have fulfilled;* but the E. V. conveys the meaning quite accurately.—R.] Not completely discharged the office of the gospel (Beza, Bengel, and others), but completely *spread* the gospel. The expression, therefore, does not mean: accomplished every thing with the gospel (Luther), or, perfectly declared the gospel (Olshausen). See Meyer [p. 527] for other explanations. The difficulty disappears if we appreciate the circumstances and method of the apostles. They had neither time nor calling to perform missionary labor in every village; they understood their calling in a universally historic and dynamic sense, and, consequently, when they had once conquered the fortresses, they had also conquered the surrounding country.

B. Vers. 20–24.—Ver. 20. **Yet on this wise making it my ambition** [οὕτω δὲ φιλοτιμούμενον. See *Textual Note* [8]. The verb means: *to make it a point of honor.* Alford thinks, however, that it loses its primary meaning here, which is doubtful.—R.] See the Lexicons. The φιλοτιμούμενον, as an accusative dependent on με, see 2 Cor. x. 15.

Was already named [ὅπου ὠνομάσθη]. Has been named according to His name.—This principle [which must not be deemed an attempt to avoid opposition (Reiche, and others).—R.] was in harmony with the labors of the apostles everywhere, because they had to lay the foundation. But it had a special meaning for Paul—that he had to establish the gospel in its full and most universal diffusion, and therein would not collide with the often nationally qualified, though evangelically free, missionary methods of the other apostles (see Gal. ii.). The subsequent settlement of John in Ephesus was the result of a call to lay an ideal and unifying foundation, by means of which even the work of Paul could be carried further forward; besides, the labors of John embraced many churches which had arisen after Paul's labors in that region.

Ver. 21. **But as it is written.** [See *Textual Note* [9]. Ἀλλά introduces the positive explanation of οὕτω, *on this wise;* not where others had preached, but according to this rule of Scripture.—R.] Isa. lii. 15, according to the LXX. Meyer says that the subject is the (there mentioned) *kings*, not the *nations.* Not at all, even if the subject be violently rent asunder into two parts. The universal impulse of the gospel to go farther and farther into every land, was already expressed in prophecy.

Ver. 22. **For which cause also I have been for the most part hindered** [διὸ καὶ ἐνεκοπτόμην τὰ πολλά]. Because he had to carry on his missionary labors now here and now there in the East. According to Meyer, Paul would say: By this means I have been hindered in most cases (τὰ πολλά), besides other instances. Undoubtedly the Apostle knows also other instances of hindrance; see 1 Thess. ii 18.*

Ver. 23. **No more having place** [μηκέτι τόπον ἔχων]. Meyer, following Luther: *space, scope.* [Philippi, De Wette, Alford: *opportunity, occasion.*—R.] But the Apostle's scope was conditioned by a standing place, a central point; and here it is most natural to think of such a place. Tholuck: "The apostles were accustomed to carry on missionary labor in the metropolitan cities, leaving the further extension of the gospel to the churches established there, and therefore, after all, to let the *pagani* remain heathen."

Ver. 24. **Whensoever.** The ὡς ἄν [instead of ἐάν (*Rec.*).—R.]: *quandocunque.*—**Spain** [Σπανίαν]. Usually called Iberia by the Greeks The Roman *Hispania.* According to Meyer, this plan for his journey was not fulfilled; according to Tholuck, the question depends on whether we accept a second Roman captivity, and this again on the evidence of Clemens Romanius. See the *Introduction* to this Epistle [especially Dr. Schaff's note on p. 11], as well as the *Introduction* to the Pastoral Epistles. Neander, i., p. 525; Wieseler, *Chron. des apost. Zeitalters,* 1. *Excursus.* As a church already exists in Rome, although not established by an apostle, the Apostle cannot designate Rome as his principal object before Rome had met him in this respect; but as ancient Spain embraced the whole Pyrenean peninsula, it undoubtedly has for the Apostle the still further significance of a symbol of the whole West extending beyond Rome. To him, Spain meant the Western world. But Spain itself was a proper object, because there the two preliminary conditions of missionary labor already existed: Jews and Jewish synagogues, and Grecian and Roman civilization. It does not follow, as Meyer supposes, that Paul gave up his plan of going to Spain after receiving the news, in his first captivity, on the state of things in the East, and thought chiefly of a *return;* Phil. ii. 24.

[**I will come to you.** This clause is retained by Dr. Lange. See *Textual Notes* [11] and [12]. Rejecting it, we paraphrase: But now I have no longer a central point for labor in these parts, and (as I am seeking to begin labor in the extreme West) I have had a desire to see you for many years while on my way to Spain. For (now that there is some hope of my starting for Spain, and as you are the Christian church nearest that region) I trust, &c.—R.]

And to be sent forward (on my journey) **thither by you** [καὶ ἀφ' ὑμῶν προπεμφθῆναι. The ἀπό denotes not merely *by them,* but *from them,* as a new point of departure.—R.] The expression προπεμφ. not only expresses a real attendance, such as Paul generally received from the churches for his further journey, but also the friendly furtherance of his journey, or even the friendly dismission; Acts xxi. 8.—**In some measure** [ἀπὸ μέρους. Grotius: "*Non quantum* VELLEM, *sed quantum* LICEBIT.—R.] An expression of the high regard in which he held their fellowship.—**Filled,** ἐμπλησθῶ, by spiritual satiation.

C. Vers. 25–33.—Ver. 25. **But now I go.** He regards this new official hindrance as the last.—[**Ministering,** διακονῶν. Present participle, not the future; the journey is part of the ministry, the whole action is already begun. This is lost sight of in the E. V.; Amer. Bible Union: "I am going

* [Philippi, Hodge, and others, adopt this view of τὰ πολλά as = *plerumque, for the most part*—*i. e.,* this was the principal reason. Alford follows Schott and De Wette, who understand it to mean: *these many times*—*i. e.,* so often. Stuart calls attention to καί as indicating the impossibility of his coming hitherto.—R.]

to Jerusalem to minister," is even more objectionable.—R.] On the collection mentioned, see 2 Cor. ix. 1, 2; Acts xxiv. 17. Origen is of the opinion that he wished to bring this collection home to the hearts of the Romans too.* He had time enough still for this.

Ver. 26. **For Macedonia and Achaia thought it good** [εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα. Dr. Lange: *were joyfully willing.* The above rendering is perhaps scarcely strong enough, but is taken from later revisions. It seems best to preserve the personification of the orginal.—R.] The translation: *they have wished*, does not at all do justice to the εὐδοκ.

A certain contribution [κοινωνίαν τινά. Literally, a certain communion or participation. As used here of a contribution, "*honesta et æqu tatis plena a pellatio*" (Bengel).—R.] As the symbol and expression of the κοινωνία, it is itself κοινωνία. The later giving of alms, and particularly that of the Middle Ages, has not kept this meaning in view. Τινά softens the force. Meyer says: "There is no further trace in the Epistles of Paul of the community of goods." We might add: There is no trace from the outset of a legally carried out community of goods!

Ver. 27. [**For they thought it good,** εὐδόκησαν γάρ. The γάρ introduces an explanation of εὐδόκησαν (ver. 26). The clause is = *for they thought it good being their debtors.*—R.]—**In spiritual things.** A statement of the cause of the propriety of this relief in temporal matters.—[**To minister,** λειτουργῆσαι. The figurative priestly service is still in mind, and to it belongs the privilege and duty of providing for the poor saints. Who, then, cannot be Christ's priest, so long as we have Christ's poor with us?—R.]—**In carnal things.** The σαρκικά denote, in a general idea, *external* things; σάρξ is the external, material, and finite side of human life, of life in general. Conclusion *a majori ad minus.*

Ver. 28. **And have secured to them.** Σφραγίζεσθαι. Luther [marginal reading]: "Truly and faithfully preserved to deliver up." To this belongs also here the full spiritual meaning and effect. Strange view: *When I have brought over to them the money, sealed* (Erasmus, and others). Still more strange: *When I have safely effected, with letter and seal, the proper delivery of their collection.* It may be that, by sealing, the Apostle alludes to the usual method of the world in the management of money affairs, as, for example, in Phil. iv. 15. Meyer: Vouched for; that is, corroborated as the fruit ripened for them.—[**This fruit,** τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον; *i. e.*, the amount of the collection. There seems to be no reference to the fruit of love or faith, still less of Paul's activity.—R.]

Ver. 29. **And I know,** &c. [οἶδα δέ, κ.τ.λ. See *Textual Note* [15].] A text applicable in many ways for installation sermons.

Ver. 30. **Now I beseech you.** The Apostle's wonderful presentiment of what he has to experience in Jerusalem; see Acts xx. 22; xxi. 10 ff.

By our Lord Jesus Christ. Διά, see chap. xii. 1.—**By the love of the Spirit.** Meyer: The love effected by the Holy Spirit. As this is self-evident, Paul means a love extending itself with the Christian spirit, so as to embrace in its universality the entire kingdom of God, which can pray for all affairs of the kingdom and its administrators, and overflows the whole earth.

In your prayers. Codd. D. E. [F. G.] add the proper gloss ὑμῶν; Col. iv. 12. [See *Textual Note* [17]. It is not genuine, though correct.—R.]

Ver. 31. [**The disobedient,** ἀπειθούντων. Either *unbelieving* (E. V., Hodge, De Wette, and others) or *disobedient* (Philippi, and others). The two ideas are intimately related in the New Testament, but the latter seems the prominent one here. —R.] The Apostle describes the unbelieving Jews as disobedient. Those were, in a special sense, rebels against the Messiah, who refused the obedience of faith.—**My ministration** [ἡ διακονία μου]. Meyer: My rendering of service designed for Jerusalem.—[**May prove acceptable.** Of this he had doubts, and with good reason.* Yet he adds: **to the saints.**—R.]

Ver. 32. **That I may come unto you in joy** [ἵνα ἐν χαρᾷ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς. *In* the element of *joy;* the emphasis rests on this phrase.—R.] As if he had, to a certain extent, forebodings that he might come to them in sad circumstances, as a captive.

And may with you be refreshed. By spiritual interchange. [Alford: "That we may mutually refresh ourselves; I after my dangers and deliverances, you after your anxieties for me." See *Textual Note* [20].—R.]

Ver. 33. **Now the God of peace.** It is very natural for him here to call God the God of peace, in consequence of *his* conflicts and *their* differences. Grotius accepts the latter alone; Meyer, the former alone; Philippi, the peace of reconciliation; Fritzsche, salvation in a general sense; Tholuck, "different occasions;" see chap. xvi. 20; Phil. iv. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. xiii. 20.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. On the great importance of this section, see the *Introduction*, the *Arrangement*, and the *Summary*.
2. On ver. 14. The church of that day at Rome, compared with that of the present day.
3. On ver. 15. The sense of the calling and the duty of the calling embolden. The Apostle's sense of his great calling.
4. Grand view of the conversion of the whole world. An offering in which the nations are offered to God. Christ, as the High-Priest, has brought a propitiatory sacrifice; now the ministers, as subordinate priests, must present the thank-offering and burnt-offering. But what a source of worship, and of the elevation and purification of worship, has proceeded from the ministerial service of Paul in both an extensive and intensive respect: churches, church-towers, hymns, prayers, festivals without number, and praising Gentiles (vers. 10, 11). The antiphony of praising Gentiles (ver. 11) responds to the extolling intonation of the Apostle (ver. 10).

* [A most gratuitous assumption is that of Schott, that these collections were to win favor, and protect him during his absence in the extreme West. Decidedly unpauline! —R.]

* [The existence of a coolness between Paul and the Christians at Jerusalem, perhaps the great body of them, is evident from the Epistle to the Galatians and the Acts of the Apostles. But this by no means implies either a want of unity among the apostles personally, or different gospels. See Lange's *Comm. Galatians*, pp. 40, 53; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, Dissertation iii. pp. 283 ff., St. Paul and the Three.—R.]

Hodge: "In this beautiful passage we see the nature of the only priesthood which belongs to the Christian ministry. It is not their office to make atonement for sin, or to offer a propitiatory sacrifice to God, but, by the preaching of the gospel, to bring men, by the influence of the Holy Spirit, to offer themselves as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God." Comp. Calvin.—R.]

5 Paul's missionary sphere. See his *Life* in the *Introduction*.

6. Paul's principle in ver. 20; a principle of genuine churchliness in contrast with hierarchical and sectarian propagandism. [The term used by the Apostle belongs to the sphere of minor morals, to "a point of honor," indeed. Yet the principle is not unimportant. Men may be Christians, and disregard it, but not *Christian gentlemen*, not men possessed of that delicate sense of propriety which no rules can impart. Besides, such efforts at proselyting generally ignore the essential graces of Christianity: humility, self-abnegation, charity. He who insists on missionary efforts among Christian people, is necessarily uncharitable. Sects whose main efforts are in this channel, will not be celebrated for the *graces* of Christianity. Moreover, Christian ethics have so far informed the world, that ungodly men recognize the necessity of "honorable" conduct in Christian workers, and can sneer at the unseemly "competitions" of much that is called pious zeal. This does not prove that the world's sense of honor is higher than that of the Church, but that the standard of sectarian proselytists is far too low. That a man can be a zealous missionary and not be a meddlesome propagandist, is evident from the case of this Apostle.—R.]

7. On ver. 23. The thoroughly dynamical view which the apostles had of the world, is reflected even in their thoroughly dynamical missionary method, according to which they conquered the capital and central points of the ancient world.

8. Vers. 26 ff. The idea of fellowship in its full universality. The sacred method in the matter of collections: (1.) An assignment of reasons (debtors); (2.) Voluntariness; (3.) Authentication; (4.) Connection with the purposes of God's kingdom.

9. Spain, as the representative of France, Britain, Germany, and Scandinavia. [And of America, too! For from the neighborhood of the pillars of Hercules, toward which Paul's missionary zeal led him, the voyager sailed who discovered the new world.—R.] How does the matter stand now? Paul through Rome to Spain—this has again become a prospect of the present day, or a *pium desiderium*. [From Spain to Rome seems the likelier course; yet, where Spain has long held her hand, how strong is the rule of Rome!—R.]

10. On the Apostle's great anticipation, see the *Exeg. Notes*.

11. Prayer a wrestling and striving. See the history of Jacob at Jabbok. The Israelites = God's warriors. Christians at Rome must now help the Apostle to fight against the schemes of degenerate warriors of God.

12. *The God of peace*. As an infinite source of peace, as if peace itself constituted His divinity. So the *love of the Spirit*; the whole Spirit which in Christianity is poured out over the earth, must be regarded as a breath of Love and of Spring exhaling over the earth.

13. *Amen*. See the Lexicons, the Concordance, and the Catechisms. Also the conclusion of chap. xvi.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL

Chap. xv. 14–33.

The good testimony which Paul gives to the Christians at Rome (ver. 14).—The Apostle's call as the Apostle to the Gentiles. 1. From whom did he receive it? From God, who gave him this grace (comp. chap. i. 5; xii. 3; Gal. i. 1). 2. How did he regard it? As a priestly employment in the sanctuary of the New Testament. 3. What blessing did he derive from it? He brought the Gentiles to obedience to the gospel. 4. By what rule did he administer it? To preach the gospel only where it was not yet known (vers. 14–21).—The proclamation of the gospel regarded as a priestly service (ver. 16).—The task of the missionary to the heathen. 1. What is it? To administer the gospel among the heathen; that is, to declare it with priestly consecration, devotion, and patience. 2. What should be its constant end? To labor that the heathen may be an offering, *a.* acceptable to God; *b.* sanctified by the Holy Ghost (vers. 15, 16). —The most beautiful and best glory is, when we can glory of serving God (ver. 17).—The right means for conversion (vers. 18, 19).—Paul's great field of labor (ver. 19).—The *first* missionary sphere among the Gentiles (ver. 19).—From East to West! That was the course of the gospel in the first period of the Christian Church. But it has subsequently come to be from West to East! (ver. 19.)—To build on another man's foundation, a mark of sectarianism (ver. 20). Common nowadays.

The Apostle Paul's plans for his last journeys. 1. They bear witness to his enterprising spirit, which continued fresh in Christian joy even to his old age; 2. But they are accompanied by anxious forebodings, that lead him to request the intercession of others (vers. 22–33).—Christian collections. 1. How must we regard them? As a service rendered to the saints; either, because, *a.* spiritual gifts have been received from a certain quarter, for which service in temporal goods is willingly shown; or, *b.* because brotherly love always requires us to do good to every man, but especially to those who are of the household of faith (Gal. vi. 10). 2. How must they be taken up? *a.* In such a way that no moral compulsion be exercised; *b.* But so that all givers can bring their gifts willingly (vers. 25–28).—Only he who can say, with Paul, "I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ," can cheerfully respond to a call to preach to another congregation (ver. 29).—The fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ. It consists: 1. In unconverted people being won to the kingdom of God; 2. In converted people being furthered in knowledge, faith, and holiness (ver. 29).—The Apostle's request for the intercession of the Church at Rome in his behalf. 1. *Motives:* The Church should intercede for him: *a.* For the Lord Jesus Christ's sake—that is, for the sake of the Lord's honor; *b.* For the love of the Spirit—that is, on account of the fraternal fellowship effected by the Holy Ghost between the Apostle and the Church. 2. *The object of the intercession: a.* On the one hand, the deliverance of the Apostle from the unbelievers in Judea; *b.* The friendly reception of his service of love (the collection) by the saints there. 3. *The desired result: a.* That he should come to Rome in peace; *b* And might be refreshed with the Church in Rome (vers.

30–32).—The God of patience and comfort is a God of hope, and the God of hope is a God of peace (ver. 32; comp. vers. 5, 13).

LUTHER: On vers. 14, 15: This is, though you do not need my writing, yet I am urged by my office, which I have by God's grace, to teach and to admonish every one of you.

STARKE: Blessed be the land which is full of the gospel of Christ! That is more than if it were full of gold and silver (ver. 19).—Do not remove from one place to another without necessity and a good cause; remain in your country, and live honestly (ver. 23).—HEDINGER: Notice that Paul will not build on any other man's foundation; but now it is nothing new in the Church for one to take from another his good ground, Christ, by clamoring, exciting suspicion, and other forms of wickedness (ver. 20).—What does love for Christ not do? What a journey to Rome and Spain? Friend, are you not an official successor of Paul, a pastor, and a shepherd of souls? How many miles do you have to go on the way to the preaching stations, the school, or the private house of one of your hearers? How often, and how willingly, do you make the visit? (ver. 24.)—Praying is the same as fighting. It is greater labor than ploughing. But how indifferently do you regard it! (ver. 30.)

SPENER, on ver. 29: Such confidence of the preacher in the fellowship of his flock effects much good, for it proves love. A want of confidence, on the other hand, destroys much edification.—To the ministerial office there belong: 1. Teaching; 2. Care for the poor; 3. Admonition of the hearers to prayer (vers. 14–33).—He is not worthy to be in Christ's kingdom and to enjoy it, who does not daily pray that it may be extended (ver. 30).

GERLACH: Paul regards himself as a priest, who, by the preaching of the gospel, prepares and presents to God the offering of the whole Gentile world.

HEUBNER: Paul's solicitude lay: 1. In the office which was given to him, with which he also received strength; 2. In the holy love which he had. Where both of these exist, admonitions are never wholly fruitless (ver. 15).—A minister who is merely a preacher, becomes a talker; but, reversely, the priest should always be a preacher, or else he will be merely a Japanese bonze (ver. 16).—Christian love has regard for the rights of others (ver. 20).—The highest service of missionaries is, that they must begin from the very start, and labor with the rough material (ver. 21).—The change in the circle of operation.—The journeys of the Apostles, which were holy, abundant in blessing, and full of suffering (ver. 24).—Spiritual benefactors are the highest, and though temporal blessings cannot perfectly requite their spiritual benefits, we should nevertheless repay even with them (vers. 26, 27).—Christians should not come empty to each other, but with spiritual blessings (ver. 29).—The power of Christian intercession (ver. 30).

BESSER: The Apostle's official seal to the Epistle to the Romans (vers. 14–33).—The pure sacrificial vessel is the gospel of God; the Gentiles, brought by faith in this vessel, are an acceptable offering, sanctified by the Holy Spirit, who is the sacrificial fire from heaven (1 Peter i. 12), who continues the holy burning by which Christ has sanctified himself for a burnt-offering for all (ver. 16).—*Miracles* in themselves are no proof of truth; but as signs of the real Christ, the miracles of the Apostles imprint a seal upon their doctrine for the joy of believers and for the judgment of unbelievers (vers 18, 19).—The fight of faith is fought by him who prays, seeing and feeling the opposite of his hope, and seeking the concealed face of God, who is a God of hope (ver. 30).—God gives peace everywhere and in every manner (2 Thess. iii. 16): Peace in believing on His grace (chap. v. 1), peace in reliance on the love of His government (chap. viii. 28), peace in the certainty that Christ reigns over His enemies (chap. xvi. 20), and peace in the love of the Spirit (ver. 33).

[BURKITT: As we honor the God of peace, whom we serve; as we love the Prince of peace, in whom we believe; as we hope for the comfort of the Spirit of peace, and as we cherish the success of the gospel of peace, let us preserve it where it is, and pursue it where it flies from us.—HENRY: The blessing of the gospel is the treasure which we have in earthen vessels. When ministers are fully prepared to give, and people fully prepared to receive, this blessing, both are happy. Many have the gospel who have not the blessing of the gospel, and so they have it in vain. The gospel will not profit, unless God bless it on us; and it is our duty to wait upon Him for that blessing, and for the fulness of it.

[DODDRIDGE: Let us adore the God of grace and peace, who works the most important ends by methods unthought of by us; and let us be very cautious that we do not rashly judge that He hath rejected our prayers, because we do not see them answered in that particular way which might have been more agreeable to our own wishes.—CLARKE: Beware of contentions in religion; if you dispute concerning any of its doctrines, let it be to find out truth, not to support a preconceived and preëstablished opinion. Avoid all polemical heat and rancor; these prove the absence of the religion of Christ. Whatever does not lead you to love God and man more, is most assuredly from beneath. The God of peace is the author of Christianity; and the Prince of peace, the priest and sacrifice of it; therefore love one another, and leave off contention before it be meddled with.

[HODGE: As oil poured on water smoothes its surface and renders it transparent, so does kindness calm the minds of men, and prepare them for the ready entrance of the truth. Besides these qualifications, he who admonishes others should be entitled thus to act. It is not necessary that this title should rest on his official station; but there should be superiority of some kind—of age, excellence, or knowledge—to give his admonitions due effect.—BARNES: The success of a minister is not for his own praises, but for the honor of God; not by his skill or power, but by the aid of Jesus Christ.—God may disappoint us in regard to the mode in which we purpose to do good; but if we really desire it, He will enable us to do it in His own way. It may be better to preach the gospel in bonds than at liberty; it is better to do it in a prison, than not at all. Bunyan wrote the "Pilgrim's Progress" to amuse his heavy hours during a twelve years' cruel imprisonment. If he had been at liberty, he probably would not have written it at all.—J. F. H.]

THIRD DIVISION.

THE COMMENDATION OF COMPANIONS AND HELPERS IN A SERIES OF SALUTATIONS WITH WHICH IS JOINED A WARNING AGAINST SEPARATISTIC FALSE TEACHERS (JEWS AND GENTILES), WHO COULD HINDER AND EVEN DESTROY ROME'S DESTINY AND HIS APOSTOLIC MISSION. YET THE GOD OF PEACE WILL SHORTLY BRUISE SATAN (JUDAISTIC AND PAGANISTIC ERRORS) UNDER THEIR FEET.

CHAP. XVI. 1–20.

A. Phebe of Corinth.

1 I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which [who] is a servant [deaconess]
2 of the church which is at Cenchrea: That ye receive her in the Lord, as be-
cometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath [may have]
need of you: for she [too] hath been a succourer of many, and of myself also.

B. Roman friends.

3, 4 Greet Priscilla [Prisca][1] and Aquila, my helpers in Christ Jesus: Who
have for my life laid down their own necks: unto whom not only I give thanks,
5 but also all the churches of the Gentiles. Likewise *greet* [*salute*] the church
that is in their house. Salute my well-beloved Epenetus, who is the first-fruits
6 of Achaia [Asia][2] unto Christ. Greet [Salute] Mary, who bestowed much
7 labour on us [*or*, you].[3] Salute Andronicus and Junia [*or*, Junias],[4] my kins-
men, and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among[5] the apostles, who also
8 were in Christ before me. Greet [Salute] Amplias, my beloved in the Lord.
9 Salute Urbane [Urbanus], our helper in Christ, and Stachys my beloved.
10 Salute Apelles [the] approved in Christ. Salute them which [who] are of
11 Aristobulus' *household* [the household of Aristobulus]. Salute Herodion my
kinsman. Greet [Salute] them that be of the *household* of Narcissus, which
12 [who] are in the Lord. Salute Tryphena and Tryphosa, who labour in the
Lord. Salute the beloved Persis, which [who] laboured much in the Lord.
13, 14 Salute Rufus [the] chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine. Salute
Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes [Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas].[6]
15 and the brethren which [who] are with them. Salute Philologus, and Julia,
Nereus, and his sister, and Olympas, and all the saints which [who] are with
16 them. Salute one another with a holy kiss. The [All the][7] churches of Christ
salute you.

C. Warning against false teachers.

17 Now I beseech you, brethren, [to] mark them which [those who] cause
divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine [teaching][8] which ye have
18 [*omit* have] learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our
Lord Jesus [*omit* Jesus][9] Christ, but their own belly; and by [their] good
19 words and fair speeches[10] deceive the hearts of the simple. For your obe-
dience is come abroad unto all *men*. I am glad [rejoice] therefore on your
behalf [over you]:[11] but [*omit* but] yet I would have you wise unto [con-
20 cerning] that which is good, and simple [harmless] concerning evil. And the
God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly. The grace of our
Lord Jesus Christ *be* with you. Amen [*omit* Amen.][12]

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 3.—[Instead of Πρίσκιλλαν (*Rec.*, versions and fathers), we find Πρίσκαν in א. A. B. C. D. F. L., cursives, &c. Universally received now.

[2] Ver. 5.—[*Rec.*, with D[2] [3]. L., Syriac versions, and fathers: Ἀχαΐας. א. A. B. C. D[1]. F., most versions, Latin fathers: Ἀσίας. De Wette defends the former on the authority of the Peshito, and also because the difficulty arising

from 1 Cor. xvi. 15, where Stephanas is called the first-fruits of *Achaia*, might have occasioned the change into Ἀχαΐας. But the probability is rather that the parallel passage was written on the margin, and thus crept into the text; and as the Epistle was written in Achaia, the error was readily retained. The reading Ἀσίας is accepted by most modern editors and commentators.

[3] Ver. 6.—[*Rec.*, C². L., versions and fathers: ἡμᾶς; D. F.: ἐν ὑμῖν; ℵ. A. B. C¹., versions and fathers: ὑμᾶς. The reading last mentioned is adopted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Meyer, Alford, Tregelles; that of the *Rec.*, by Tischendorf (ed. 2), De Wette, Philippi, Lange. The internal evidence is strongly in its favor. See the *Exeg. Notes*.—*Rec.*, with ℵ D. F. L.: Μαριάμ; A. B. C., Peshito: Μαρίαν. The latter is preferred by Lachmann, Tischendorf (ed. 2) Alford, Tregelles.

[4] Ver. 7.—[See the *Exeg. Notes*.

[5] Ver. 7.—[*Among the apostles* is ambiguous. It may imply: among the apostles, as of their number, or simply that the apostles held them in high repute. The latter is decidedly preferable See the *Exeg. Notes*.

[6] Ver. 14.—[ℵ. A. B. C. D¹. F., most versions, sustain the order: Ἑρμῆν, Πατροβᾶν, Ἑρμᾶν; adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, and most modern editors. That of the *Rec.* is supported by D³. L., some Greek fathers

[7] Ver. 16.—[The authority for πᾶσαι is overwhelming (ℵ. A. B. C. L., most versions and fathers). The omission arose from the question as to whether the Apostle could speak for *all* the churches.

[8] Ver. 17.—[On *teaching* in preference to *doctrine*, see chap. x. 17, p. 212, and the *Exeg. Notes*.

[9] Ver. 18.—[The *Rec.* inserts Ἰησοῦ, but it is not found in any of the known uncial MSS., and is omitted in a number of versions.

[10] Ver. 18.—[D¹. F. omit καὶ εὐλογίας; found in ℵ. A. B. C., most versions. Probably omitted from the transcriber's mistaking the end of the previous word for that of εὐλογίας. So modern editors.

[11] Ver. 19.—[The *Rec.* has: χαίρω οὖν τὸ ἐφ' ὑμῖν, which is sustained by a number of versions, and by ℵ³.; the order is found in D. F., which omit τό, however. ℵ¹. A. B. C. L.: ἐφ' ὑμῖν οὖν χαίρω; adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Tregelles. De Wette and Philippi retain the order of the *Rec.* Besides the preponderant uncial authority, it is properly urged against the reading of the *Rec.*, that it gives the more usual order, hence likely to be an alteration. Dr. Lange calls it a correct exegetical gloss.

[12] Ver. 20.—[None of the uncial MSS. now known support the Ἀμήν of the *Rec.*, which is accordingly rejected by all critical editors.—Alford, Tregelles, and others, bracket Χριστοῦ, which is not found in ℵ. B.; but it seems best to retain it.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary.—A. Commendation of Phebe the deaconess; vers. 1, 2.—B. The salutations to his Roman friends and companions in their household churches, and the commendations therein expressed; vers. 3–16.—C. Warning against false teachers, who create dissension. Benediction; vers. 17–20.

In the Apostle's salutations he does not merely take cognizance of friendly relations in a good-natured way, but rather designs, with a distinct section of his Epistle, and in the wise and sincere form of his salutations, to awaken in the Church at Rome the consciousness that, in its principal elements, it is indirectly a Pauline church—that is, one appropriated by him in his universal efforts.* Comp., on this point, the *Introduction*, p. 33, and the construction of the Epistle. It is characteristic, that Aquila and Priscilla stand at the head of those whom he salutes; by their settlement in Ephesus they had already prepared for his connection there, just as they now had done in Rome, and afterward do again in Ephesus; 2 Tim. iv. 19. And so there are many among those saluted who have preceded him, as his precursors. The whole body of those greeted is made up of different classes. Some are helpers of his missionary labors, who have labored with him, and part of whom have exposed themselves to dangers for him: Prisca, Aquila, Mary, Andronicus, Junia, and Urbanus. A number of them are his relatives, such as Andronicus, Junia, and Herodion; or very near friends, as Rufus and his mother. Besides, there are those whom he can distinguish as disciples converted through his instrumentality, or well-known friends: Epenetus, Amplias, Stachys, Apelles; perhaps also Tryphena, Tryphosa, and Persis. We can further distinguish companies, a church in the house of Aquila, an assembly at the houses of Hermes, Hermas, and their companions; at the houses of Philologus, Julia, and their companions. Perhaps the believers in the households of Aristobulus and of Narcissus also form separate divisions of the Church.

* [Ford: "Some persons, regarding this chapter as containing little more than a register of *names*, treat it with comparative indifference; thereby defrauding their souls of much good. St. Chrysostom, in his day, had cause to complain of the same neglect shown by many to the conclusion of this Epistle. Hence he bestows special pains in explaining it. 'It is possible,' he writes, 'even from bare *names* to find a treasure:' and then he at once proceeds to disclose what the treasure is." The list of names shows: (1.) Paul's personal regard; (2.) The high place he accords to women; (3.) The constitution of the Roman Church; (4.) The great influence he exerted, if so many friends could be found in a church he had never visited. (5.) The undying name received from his friendly mention, is a type of the eternal blessing which belongs to those whose names are written in the Lamb's Book of Life. Evidently there are not many rich or great in this list—few of whom we know any thing save what is here hinted; yet these names abide, while those of the wealthy and honored have been forgotten. Even Horace and Livy give no such extended fame as Paul has done to his friends and acquaintances at Rome.—R.]

A. Vers. 1 and 2.—Ver. 1. **I commend.** [Both an introduction and a commendation are implied. The description consists of two parts: First, she is a sister, which is the general ground for welcoming her; then, more specially, she is a deaconess, who had faithfully discharged her duty (ver. 2). The name is derived from Φοῖβος, Phœbus (Apollo), but there is nothing remarkable in this, since the etymology would be as little recalled then, as now, in the case of proper names.—R.] See 2 Cor. v. 12. Phebe is usually regarded as the bearer of the Epistle.

Who is a deaconess; διάκονος. On the institution of deaconesses, comp. Church History and the Pastoral Epistles. Meyer furnishes the special literature on p. 539. [The word διακόνισσα occurs frequently in later ecclesiastical Greek. Pliny, in the celebrated letter to Trajan, says: "*Necessarium credidi, ex duabus ancillis quæ* MINISTRÆ *dicebantur, quid esset veri et per tormenta quærere.*" Their duties were, to take care of the sick, poor, and strangers in the female portion of the Church. "This office was the more needful on account of the rigid separation of the sexes at that day, especially among the Greeks" (Schaff). Meyer refers to Bingham, *Orig.* i. pp. 341–366; Schoene, *Geschichtsforsch. über d. Kirchlich. Gebräuche*, iii. pp. 102 ff.; Herzog, *Encykloped.*, iii. p. 368; Neander, *Pflanzung*, i. p. 265 f. The last named argues that the deaconesses must not be confounded with the χῆραι of 1 Tim. v. 3–16. See, however, Lange's Comm *in loco*. We may add: Schaff, *Apostolic Church*, § 135; Suicer, *Thesaurus*, *sub voce*. Of Phebe, Conybeare says (*St. Paul*, ii. p. 154): "She was a

widow of consideration and wealth, who acted as one of the deaconesses of the Church, and was now about to sail to Rome upon some private business, apparently connected with a lawsuit in which she was engaged." He adds: "She could not (according to Greek manners) have been mentioned as acting in the independent manner described, either if her husband had been living or if she had been unmarried."—R.]

Cenchrea. The eastern seaport of Corinth (see the Encyclopædias).

Ver. 2. **That ye receive her in the Lord.** She should be received with Christian interest.—**And that ye assist her** [καὶ παραστῆτε αὐτῇ. The verb is frequently used as a legal term, hence the conjecture of Conybeare, that her business at Rome was connected with a lawsuit.—R.] It is hardly probable that the early Church employed deaconesses to travel in the discharge of official business; the business of Phebe seems to have been of a personal character.

[**For she too,** καὶ γὰρ αὐτή. *She herself also*, not αὕτη (this one).—R.] The reason why the Romans should zealously support her in her affairs does not lie in an official call to Rome, but in her services for the churches at home, and for the Apostle in particular. Προστάτις is a specially honorable designation. [It may refer to her official duties, but not necessarily so. The idea it implies is of service bestowed by a superior on inferiors.—**Of myself also.** "When and where, we know not. It is not improbable that she may have been, like Lydia, one whose heart the Lord opened at the first preaching of Paul, and whose house was his lodging;" Alford.—R.]

B. Vers. 3-16.—Ver. 3. **Prisca.** [This is the real name; *Priscilla* is the diminutive, according to the common mode of forming such appellations.—R.] She belonged, like Phebe, to the women who were prominent because of the energy of their faith, and deserved the honorable position before the name of her husband, Aquila (comp. Acts xviii. 2). See 2 Tim. iv. 19. [The frequent sneers at Paul about his views respecting the female sex and their prerogatives might be spared us, were this chapter carefully read. The order here is a sufficient answer: the wife's name first, because she was foremost, no doubt. The standard is, after all, capacity, not sex. Both are called "my helpers," and it would seem that, as such, they were both engaged in spiritual labors, which term includes vastly more than public preaching.—R.]

Ver. 4. **Their own necks.** Meyer translates the ὑπέθηκαν literally: have *laid under*, under the executioner's axe. But there has been no mention made in Paul's previous history of the executioner's axe. Even Meyer himself doubts whether we should take the expression in its exact meaning. Since Paul was a member of their family, they were answerable for him in the tumults that arose in Corinth and Ephesus (Acts xviii. 12; xix. 23).—What they did for the Apostle, was done for **all the churches of the Gentiles.**

Ver. 5. **Likewise salute the church that is in their house** [καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν]. The definite prototype of an apostolical household church, the type of the later parish. At the same time, the single household churches in Rome are already connected by the bond of fellowship into one spiritual church. Accordingly, the church in the house is almost = the assembly in a certain house.* Tholuck: "In the metropolis, which was at that time about four miles in circumference, there were not less than five of them (comp Kist, in Illgen's *Zeitschrift für hist. Theologie*, ii., 2d part, p. 65)."

Epenetus. "Unknown, as all the following ones to ver. 15. (Rufus may be the son of Simon Mark xv. 21.) The legends of the Fathers made the most of them martyrs and bishops, and the *Synopsis* of Dorotheus misplaces the most of them among the seventy disciples;" Meyer.

The first-fruits of Asia [ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας. See *Textual Note* [2]]. *Asia proconsularis* The reading Achaia is less authenticated, and creates difficulty, inasmuch as, in 1 Cor. xvi. 15, Stephanas is mentioned as the first-fruits of Achaia. On the solution of this difficulty (by supposing that Epenetus was a member of the household of Stephanas, now in Rome), see Tholuck, p. 738.—[Εἰς Χριστόν. Meyer, Philippi: *with reference to Christ;* De Wette, Lange: *for Christ.* The meaning obviously is: first converted to Christ.—R.] The first-fruits, or those first converted, were generally the natural leaders of the incipient churches.

Ver. 6. **Mary.** Not more definitely known. There is no need of explaining that the reading, *bestowed much labor* † *on us*, is much more natural than the other, *on you*, for elsewhere the Apostle always brings out prominently the relations of the persons saluted to his own labors. [See *Textual Note* [3].—R.]

Ver. 7. **And Junia** (or **Junias**). The word has often been taken, and by Chrysostom [Grotius] among the rest, as a feminine noun, Junia; it seems more probable that it is Junias, an abbreviation of Junianus (see Tholuck, p. 739). [If feminine, it is the name of the wife or sister of Andronicus; the *Rec.* accents thus: Ἰουνίαν, which indicates the feminine. Most editors (not Tregelles): Ἰουνιᾶν. It is as impossible as it is unnecessary to decide the question, though Meyer thinks the added description favors the masculine form.—R.]

My kinsmen. The expression συγγενεῖς has been understood by Olshausen, and others, in the broader sense of *fellow-countrymen;* against which it has been remarked that, in that case, others than Jewish Christians have received this desig-

* [Dr. Hodge suggests that, as a tent-maker, Aquila had better accommodations for such an assembly than most of the Christians. See Alford *in loco*, where he quotes Justin Martyr's statements about these assemblies. Certainly there is no warrant for supposing that only the household servants, &c., are meant.—It is clear that the early Church was formed quite as much upon the household model as upon that of the synagogue. No form of church government should ignore this, nor can Christianity make true progress at the expense of the family. As the religion of Jesus Christ has sanctified household relations, and elevated them all, how far is the Church responsible for the manifestations of moral decay in social life? May not the schisms in families, produced by sectarian propagandism, so far interfere with any thing akin to these household churches, as to exercise a deteriorating influence? Certainly it is difficult to conceive, that any Christians at Rome would lay in wait for Prisca's children, to decoy them with presents to some other assembly. Yet that is a recognised form of ecclesiastical (I will not say Christian) effort in these days!—R.]

† [The verb κοπιᾶν, when not followed by λόγῳ, refers to practical activity, not to preaching and teaching. Here probably, some acts of womanly kindness are intended, such as Paul would be more likely to have received than the whole Roman Church. Hence "us" is more probably correct than "you." Besides, why should Paul add this description, were she so well known to that Church?—R.]

nation, besides the three thus denominated. Dr. Baur finds in these kinsmen not only a mark of the unauthenticity of chap. xvi., but even of the unfairness of the author, who, by this fiction, would make for the Apostle the favorable appearance of having sustained a more intimate relation to the Jewish-Christian Church in Rome.

My fellow-prisoners [συναιχμαλώτους μου]. Further particulars are not known. But as, according to Acts xxiii. 16, the Apostle had a nephew in Jerusalem who took a deep interest in his cause, and as it is said of Andronicus and Junias, or Junia, that they were before him in Christ—that is, were believers—so it is natural to make a family from the names of Andronicus, Junias, or better, Junia and Herodion, and to suppose that these, as the early converted kinsmen of Paul, had already made an impression in Jerusalem upon the unconverted Paul, and, after his conversion, had taken an interest in him in his captivity. Then, these were specially adapted, like Aquila and Priscilla, to prepare the way for him in Rome. This would also give a simple explanation to **among the apostles**, ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις. They were highly respected as believers among the apostles in Jerusalem. So also Meyer: "distinguished—that is, most honorably known to the apostles. Thus Beza, Grotius, and most others; De Wette, Fritzsche, and Philippi. They take the right ground, for ἀπόστολος is never used by Paul in the broader sense (as Acts xiv. 4–14), and therefore cannot be explained, with Origen, Chrysostom, Luther, Calvin, &c., and Tholuck: *among* [*i. e.*, among the number of] *the Apostles*."* See Meyer for hypotheses respecting their conversion.

Ver. 8. **Amplias.** An abbreviation of Ampliaton.—[**Beloved in the Lord**, "*beloved in the bonds of Christian fellowship*" (Alford).—R.]

Ver. 9. **Urbanus—Stachys.** The Apostle's distinctions result from an exact view.

Ver. 10. **Apelles.** This has been confounded (by Origen, and others) with Apollos, but without any ground whatever. [Comp. Horace, *Sat.*, i. 5. 100. Supposed to be a freedman, but the name was common among this class (Meyer, Philippi). There are various conjectures about the grouping of freedmen and slaves in these verses.—R.]

The approved [τὸν δόκιμον]. A predicate of tested steadfastness in faith.—**Who are of the household of Aristobulus.** That is, the Christians in the household, probably slaves of Aristobulus. See the additional ἐν κυρίῳ in the following verse. [Alford: "It does not follow that either Aristobulus or Narcissus were *themselves Christians*. Only those of their *familiæ* (τοὺς ἐκ τῶν) are here saluted who were ἐν κυρίῳ; for we must understand this also after Ἀριστοβούλου."—R.]

Ver. 11. **Narcissus.** Grotius, Neander, and others, have regarded him as a freedman of Claudius (Sueton., *Claud.* 28). [This freedman, however, was put to death two or three years before this Epistle was written. It is possible that the salutation is addressed to his family, known thus after his death.—R.]

Ver. 12. **Persis.** [The name is derived from Persia, as the native country of the bearer; but it is not known that it was borne for this reason in this particular instance.—R.] She is thus candidly distinguished from the two just named.

Ver. 13. **Rufus.** See *Commentary, Mark*, p. 151.—**The chosen.** A very expressive distinction. [Not merely "elect in Christ," but a chosen man, a distinguished Christian (Hodge).—R.]—**His mother and mine** [καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμοῦ. "*His* mother by nature, *mine* by maternal kindness" (Webster and Wilkinson).—R.]. Fervid expression of gratitude for the enjoyment of friendly care.

Ver. 14. **Hermas.** This verse contains a numerous group, probably intimately associated, and less known to the Apostle. Hermas has been regarded by Origen and Eusebius as the author of the work: Ὁ ποιμήν. But this author belongs to the middle of the second century.—**The brethren who are with them** [τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀδελφούς]. This, as well as the expression in ver. 15: *All the saints who are with them*, has been understood as referring to a household church. Incidental hypotheses: (1.) Christian associations for common business pursuits, &c. (Fritzsche, Philippi). (2.) Missionary unions (Reiche). [The latter is quite improbable.—R.]

Ver. 15. **Julia.** Probably the wife of Philologus; for, in what follows, she is distinguished from the sister of Nereus.

Ver. 16. **With a holy kiss.** Ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ, 1 Thess. v. 26. Comp. 1 Peter v. 14: ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης. "In Tertullian, it is the *osculum pacis*; the fraternal kiss after the finished prayer in the assemblies of the Christians is mentioned by Justin Martyr (M. Apol. 1. Op. 65);" Tholuck.—For further particulars, see Meyer and Winer. The continuance of this Oriental Christian custom of connecting the salutation and the kiss as an expression of fellowship and of common festivals, is known in the Greek church (see Luke vii. 45).

All the churches [αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι. See *Textual Note* 7]. As Paul has made known in many churches his intention of going to Rome, and because of this opportunity had received many salutations for Rome, he regarded himself sufficiently warranted to greet Rome in the name of all the churches, particularly of those which he had established. Grotius limits the expression to the Grecian churches; others, in other ways. [Stuart, Olshausen, to the churches in Corinth and vicinity; Bengel, to those he had visited.—R.]

C. Vers. 17–20.—Ver. 17. **Now I beseech you, brethren.** A warning against those who cause divisions and variances is very properly connected with the hearty and solemn injunction for the universal preservation of unity and harmony. See an analogous instance in Eph. vi. 10 ff. This section is, therefore, by no means "*supplementary*," as Meyer holds it to be. On the contrary, it is observed, by both him and Tholuck, that it may be inferred from the position of the Apostle's words (at the conclusion), and their brevity, that the false teachers here designated have *not yet* found entrance into the Church. He already knew that they exist

* [Luther: *welche sind berühmte Apostel.* Yet even so high an Anglican as Dr. Wordsworth accepts the view of Meyer and Lange. An able defence of the less restricted use of the term ἀπόστολος will be found in Lightfoot, *Galatians*, pp. 92 ff Still, in every case where Paul uses the word, it can be referred to others than himself and the Twelve only by catachresis. In 2 Cor. viii. 23, the article is omitted, and the word has obviously no ecclesiastical sense. Alford thinks the meaning adopted above "would imply that Paul had more frequent intercourse with the other apostles than we know that he had." Yet how strange that "noted apostles" should require this certification from Paul.—R.]

ed, and that they increased both intensively and extensively; therefore he could—as he subsequently did in his farewell address at Miletus, when setting out for Ephesus—here definitely predict their presence in Rome. Carpzov has had in mind the differences in chaps. xiv. and xv.; Clericus, and others, the early heathen philosophers. In both, the idea of Christian false teachers is wanting. Others have decided them to be Libertines. That the Apostle, at all events, had in view, besides the future Judaizing and Ebionitic zealots for the law, the gnosticizing and antinomian spirits of the future, is proved on looking at the arrangement for the reception of both these tendencies, which he, according to chaps. xiv. and xv., unquestionably found already in the Church. According to De Wette, the kind of false teachers here mentioned cannot be more specifically determined; according to Tholuck, with reference to Phil. iii. 2, &c., the zealots of the law are meant.

[Alford says: "*Judging by the text* itself, we infer that these teachers were similar to those pointed out in Phil. iii. 2, &c.: *unprincipled and selfish persons, seducing others for their own gain;* whether Judaizers or not, does not appear; but considering that the great opponents of the Apostle were of this party, we may perhaps infer that they also belonged to it."—R.]

To mark [σκοπεῖν. To notice carefully; used in Phil. iii. 17, with reference to those who should be imitated; more intensive than βλέπειν (Meyer).—R.] This, and the avoiding of them, Krehl thinks can be referred only to present false teachers, which is very properly opposed by Tholuck.—[**Divisions and offences,** τὰς διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα. The articles point to known divisions and scandals, whether Paul referred to any particular persons or not. Dr. Hodge seems disposed to refer the first word to doctrinal divisions, the latter to moral offences; so Webster and Wilkinson. Philippi and Meyer seem to refer the first to divisions, however occasioned, and the latter to temptations to depart from the gospel ground of faith and life. The objection to the former distinction is, that the "divisions" hinted at in the Epistle were mainly of an ethical rather than a doctrinal origin.—**Contrary to the teaching,** παρὰ τὴν διδαχήν. On the preposition, see Gal. i. 8, Lange's *Comm.*, p. 19. Most German commentators are disposed to reject at least the exclusive reference to doctrinal instruction. As our English word *doctrine* suggests *dogmatic theology*, we substitute *teaching*, which includes all instruction.—A commendation of their teachers is implied, which hints at the indirect Pauline origin of the Church.—**Avoid them,** ἐκκλίνατε ἀπ' αὐτῶν. There is no reference to official excommunication, but to personal treatment of those who might or might not be church members.—R.]

Ver. 18. **Serve not our Lord Christ** [τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Χριστῷ οὐ δουλεύουσιν. See *Textual Note* [9]]. See chap. ii. 8; Phil. iii. 19; 2 Cor. ii. 20. Fanaticism, by its confusion of spiritual and carnal affections and motives, degenerates into disguised sensualism.—**Their own belly** [τῇ ἑαυτῶν κοιλίᾳ]. This is a symbol of their self-interest, selfishness, sensuality, and of their lna. aiming at a mere life of pleasure; comp. 1 Tim. vi. 5; Titus i. 11.

And by their good words and fair speeches [διὰ τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας. See *Textual Note* [10]]. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 14. By good words they represent themselves in a rosy light, and by flattering speeches, their hearers. For further particulars, see Tholuck, p. 741. Melanchthon understands, by εὐλογία, religious blessings and promises; for example, those of the monks. [Hodge takes the two words as synonymous. Meyer thinks the former characterizes the *tenor*, and the latter the *form*, of their words. Χρηστ. is found only here in the New Testament. The view given by Dr Lange is quite tenable.—R.]

The simple [τῶν ἀκάκων. The unwary]. Those who, as such, can be easily deceived. [How many were deceiving and deceived, appears from Phil. i. 15, written from Rome a few years afterward.—R.]

Ver. 19. **For your obedience** [ἡ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπακοή]. The γάρ is explained in different ways:

1. It implies, indirectly, that they also are not free from this ἀκακία (Origen, Fritzsche). [Dr. Hodge takes obedience as = *obedient disposition*, and, with others, regards this as implying a liability to be led astray. But "obedience," without further definition, would mean the "obedience of faith," in this Epistle at least; besides, this view implies that their obedience was not altogether of a commendable character.—R.]

2. It implies an antithesis; as for the Roman Christians, he knows that they, as being obedient to the gospel, cannot be so easily deceived (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Meyer).*

3. The γάρ specifies a second ground for ver 17 (Tholuck, De Wette, Philippi). [So Alford. But Meyer correctly says, that γάρ is never repeated thus in a strictly coördinate relation. Alford finds also a slight reproof here.—R.]

Explanation (1.) is, as it seems to us, very aptly modified by Rückert. Since they succeeded in deceiving the simple, they will *think* that they can also easily find an entrance to you, for they regard your obedience, which is everywhere known, as that very simplicity. [This avoids the objection to which the view, as held by Dr. Hodge, is open. Still, Meyer seems nearest the true explanation.—R.]

I rejoice therefore over you [ἐφ' ὑμῖν οὖν χαίρω. See *Textual Note* [11]. The emphatic position of ἐφ' ὑμῖν favors Meyer's view of γάρ while the next clause, with its adversative δέ, seems to introduce the real warning.—R.] It is, at all events, desirable that they allow themselves to be warned, according to the rule which the Apostle lays down.

Wise [σοφούς. ℵ. A. C., *Rec.*, insert μὲν which seems to be an interpolation on account of δέ, which follows.—R.] They should be receptive inquirers after what is good. But, on the other hand, they should be as unreceptive of, and unteachable in, what is bad, as if they were simple-hearted people.—**Harmless.** [Dr. Lange renders: *ungelehrig, einfältig, simple*, as in E. V. But *harmless* seems to be preferable, especially as another

* [Meyer finds the ground for this antithesis in the position of ἀκάκων . . . ὑμῶν, and paraphrases: "Not without ground do I say the hearts of *the simple;* for *you* they will not seduce, because *you* do not belong to the simple; but *you are so noted for your obedience* (to the gospel), that it is everywhere known; *about you* I am therefore glad, yet I would have you wise and pure," &c. "An elegant mingling of the warning with the expression of firm confidence." This view is now favored by Philippi, and is not open to the objection urged against (1.), nor does it present any grammatical difficulty whatever.—R.]

Greek word has been rendered "simple" just before (ver. 18).—R.] Meyer explains *ἀκεραίους* by *pure* [*i. e.*, unmixed with, free from, evil], which does not make an antithesis to the foregoing (comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 20). Matt. x. 16, on the contrary, constitutes a harmonious antithesis to the whole passage. For different expositions of the *ἀκεραίους*, see Tholuck. [Dr. Hodge: "Wise, so that good may result, and simple, so that evil may not be done;" so most commentators.—R.]

Ver. 20. **And the God of peace, &c.** [*ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, κ.τ.λ.*] In the divine power of the Spirit and Author of peace. It is just as the God of peace that He will bruise Satan, who, by his false doctrines, causes divisions, and rends the Church asunder. The *συντρίψει*, **shall bruise**, is the prophetic future; but not optatively, according to Flatt [Stuart] (see 2 Cor. xi. 15). The expression is an allusion to Gen. iii. 15.

The grace, &c. This is the usual concluding benediction (see 2 Cor. xiii. 13). In 2 Thess. iii. 16, 18, a concluding salutation also follows the benediction. [The presence of the benediction here has led to various conjectures: that Paul intended to close, but afterward added the salutations; that ver. 24 is not genuine, since it only repeats this doxology, &c. But the text is well sustained here, except the final **Amen** (see *Textual Note* [12]); and certainly no one has a right to say that Paul shall always close his Epistles in the same way, or to impugn either the genuineness of the text or the inspiration of the author, because he does not conform to a certain mode (however customary with him). —R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. We become best acquainted with the nature of the office of deaconess in apostolic times from the Pastoral Epistles. From these it is evident, first of all, that this office was not of a missionary character, but a local service in the Church, springing from Christian consecration, and more exactly defined, by the restraint then placed on women, by the general destination of the sex, as well as by age and character. This form of the office in the early Church was succeeded, in the Middle Ages, by the religious orders, which assumed, besides, a qualified missionary function. Recent times have attempted glorious things in relation to this office, and have accomplished great results; but the full development of the matter from the idea of a local evangelical service, into which, in its wider sense, all the female members of the Church are called, remains a grand problem for the Evangelical Church. [Woman's work in the Church *diaconal*, not *ministerial.*—All Christian women called to a diaconal service; some to a more special, and perhaps official, service of this nature.—The danger of the mediæval extreme best avoided by regarding the Church as founded upon the family; not intended to override it (see the household churches named here). How are we Protestants ignoring this idea?—The diaconal service a priestly one (chap. xv. 27); noble, however humble it appears.—R.]

2. The commendation of Phebe, a model for Christian commendations.

3. The Apostle's salutations. Christianity is as intensively personal in a holy sense, as actually free from the ungodly respect of persons. The Apostle's friends as preparers of his way, and witnesses of his greatness and humility. His brief descriptions of them are models of a proper estimation of persons, free from all flattery. A group of constellations in the apostolic age, as a segment of that spiritual starry sky which eternity will reveal.

4. The warning against the false teachers. See the *Exeg. Notes.*

5. The Apostle's glorious prophecy opens a still greater future for Rome. We also read, in Matt. xiii., that it is Satan who sows the tares among the wheat, and thereby causes offences. False teaching seems here to be a ground of divisions and offences. The first practically evil effect proceeds outwardly, the other comes inwardly.

6. It has been said, that the Apostle has pronounced too hard a sentence on his opponents. But the Apostle had established the great festival of peace, and therefore he must regard the enemies of God's Church of peace as just what they really are —the demoniacal disturbers of the institution of a heavenly life on earth.

(The Homiletical and Practical Notes are at the end of the chapter.)

CONCLUSION.

THE GREETINGS OF THE PAULINE CIRCLE TO THE CHURCH AT ROME, AND THE INVOCATION OF BLESSINGS BY PAUL HIMSELF. HIS DOXOLOGICAL SEALING OF THE GOSPEL FOR ALL TIME BY A REAL ANTIPHONICAL AMEN.

CHAP. XVI. 21–27.

A.

21 Timotheus my workfellow [saluteth you],[1] and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosi-
22 pater, my kinsmen, salute you [*omit* salute you]. I Tertius, who wrote *this*
23 [the] epistle, salute you in the Lord. Gaius mine host, and [*the host*] of the

whole church, saluteth you. Erastus the chamberlain [treasurer] of the city
24 saluteth you, and Quartus a [our] brother. The[2] grace of our Lord Jesus
Christ *be* with you all. Amen.

B.

25 Now to him that is of power [who is able][3] to stablish you according to my
gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the
mystery, which was kept secret [in silence] since the world began [during eter-
26 nal ages], But now is made manifest, and by [through] the Scriptures of the
prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, [is] made
27 known to all nations for [unto] the obedience of faith: To God only wise, *be*
glory through Jesus Christ for ever [To the only wise God, through Jesus
Christ; to whom be the glory for ever].[4] Amen.

[TO THE ROMANS.]*

TEXTUAL.

[1] Ver. 21.—[The *Rec.*, with D[3]. L., and a few minor authorities, reads: ἀσπάζονται. ℵ. A. B. C. D[1]. F.: ἀσπάζεται; adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, &c., since the alteration to the plural (from the number of persons named) was so likely to occur.—The E. V. must therefore be emended as above.

[2] Ver. 24.—[This verse is wanting in ℵ. A. B. C., and in other important authorities. In some cursives, and in some copies of the Peshito, it is found after ver. 27. D. F. L., Greek and Latin fathers, insert it here. It is rejected by Lachmann, Koppe, Reiche, Tregelles; bracketted by Alford; accepted by Meyer and Lange (Tischendorf varies). It was not inserted to form a proper ending to the Epistle, since the authorities which omit it have the concluding doxology; but was probably omitted on account of the unusual combination of the benediction and doxology. So Dr. Lange, who makes the doxology a liturgical antiphony, expanding the "Amen" of this verse, and of course retains vers. 24–27 in this place.

[3] Ver. 25.—[The emendations are from the revisions of the Amer. Bible Union, Five Ang. Clergymen, and Noyes. Dr. Lange's rendering is, in some respects peculiar: "But to Him, who can make you strong (chap. i. 11): According to (as an antiphony to) my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ,—according to the revelation of the mystery; that was kept in silence since eternal ages; but that has been now made manifest, as through the prophetical Scriptures;—according to the command of the everlasting God, made known among all nations for the purpose of their obedience of faith:

To the only wise God—
Through Jesus Christ, whose is the glory—
Into eternity an (*accordant*) AMEN."

It will be noticed that this differs from the usual view, in some of its details as well as in the liturgical view it presents. See further the *Exeg. Notes*.

[4] Ver. 27.—[*On the concluding Doxology*. (1.) Vers. 25–27 are found here, in ℵ. B. C. D., Vulgate, Peshito, and other versions, in some fathers. So the *Rec.*, Erasmus, Beza (eds. 3–5), Bengel, Koppe, Lachmann, Scholz, Fritzsche, De Wette, Rückert, Philippi, Tischendorf, Tholuck, Ewald, Meyer, Alford. Tregelles, Lange, and many others. (2.) They stand after chap. xiv. 23 in L., nearly all cursives (Alford says 192), in the Greek lectionaries, in Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, &c. This position is accepted by Beza (eds. 1, 2), Grotius, Mill, Wetstein, Paulus, Eichhorn (and most of those who deny the integrity of the Epistle), but not by the latest critical editors. (3.) They are found in both places in A. and a few cursives, which is indefensible. (4.) They are omitted in D[3]. (or rather marked for erasure by the corrector) F. G. (both, however, leaving a space in chap. xiv., as if intending to insert there). Marcion, some manuscripts in Jerome. Schmidt, Reiche, Krehl reject them as not genuine.—We inquire, then:

I. Is this Doxology *genuine?* A careful scrutiny of the external authorities as given above justifies the opinion of Alford: "Its genuineness as a part of the Epistle is placed *beyond all reasonable doubt*." The few authorities which omit it altogether, seem to have done so with no intention of rejecting it. The variation in position is so readily accounted for, as to cast little doubt on the genuineness. Nor is the internal evidence against it. The style is Pauline. Though the other Pauline doxologies are simpler, this was the close of the greatest Epistle. Reiche thinks that, owing to the personal character of chaps. xv., xvi., the public reading closed with chap. xiv.; that then a doxology was spoken, which crept into the text at that point, and afterward was transferred to the close. But this is mere conjecture. (See Meyer.)

II. What, then, is its *true position?* We answer, without hesitation, at the close of chap. xvi. (1.) The weight, if not the number of diplomatic authorities favors this position. (2.) In accounting for the variation, it is much easier to account for the change from this place to chap. xiv., than for the reverse. The doxology forms an unusual conclusion; it was preceded by the usual closing benediction; the words ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι would seem to point to the "weak" (chap. xiv). Other theories are advanced, but this seems the simplest explanation of the change.—The repetition in some authorities is easily accounted for, since the early criticism could not decide where it properly belonged, and yet feared to reject; the omission arose from the same doubt (since F. G. both have a blank space in chap. xiv.).—Dr Lange's view of the connection renders extended critical discussion unnecessary.—R.]

* [SUBSCRIPTION. That of the *Rec.* is probably correct, but not genuine. ℵ. A. B[1]. C. D. G. have: πρὸς Ῥωμαίους; to this B[2]. and others add: ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Κορίνθου; G.: ἐτελέσθη.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

A. The salutations.—B. The doxology, in conformity with the fundamental thought of the Epistle, in the form of a liturgical antiphony. The everlasting Amen of the Church as a response to the everlasting gospel of God, as an Amen: 1. To the proclamation of the gospel in general; 2. To Paul's proclamation of the call of the Gentiles, 3. To God's command to bear the gospel forth unto all nations, for the consummation of which our Epistle is designed.

A. Vers. 21–24.—Ver. 21. **Timotheus.** See Acts xx. 4; also the Encyclopædias.*—**Lucius**

* [Comp. Van Oosterzee (Lange's *Comm.*), 1 *Timothy*, Introd., § 1.—R.]

Not Luke (Origen, and others). "It is uncertain whether this is the Lucius of Cyrene in Acts xiii. 1."—**Jason.** Comp. Acts xvii. 5.—**Sosipater.** Acts xx. 4. The identity is, at least, by no means improbable. [In regard to these three persons commentators differ. All three *may be* identical with those mentioned in the Acts, yet all the names were common, while Sosipater and Sopater (Acts xx. 4) may be the same name, without the identity of persons being thereby established.—**My kinsmen,** οἱ συγγενεῖς μου. See vers. 7, 11. It seems probable that some relationship more close than that of fellow-Jew is here referred to.—R.]

Ver. 22. **Tertius.** Probably an Italian (he has, without any ground, been identified with Silas;* see Meyer). The writer of this Epistle, which Paul dictated to him. On other untenable hypotheses (a clean copy; a translation into Greek), see Meyer. It was natural that he should present his own salutation. [Tholuck considers this irregularity a corroboration of the genuineness of the chapter.—R.] Groundless suppositions: 1. Paul wrote from ver. 23 with his own hand (Rambach); 2. From ver. 23, Tertius wrote in his own name (Glöckler). ["Entirely groundless also is the view of Olshausen: Paul wrote the doxology immediately after ver. 20, but on a special and small parchment, the vacant side of which was used by the amanuensis, Tertius, in order to write vers. 21–24 in his own name;" Meyer. The internal evidence is altogether against this. —**In the Lord,** ἐν κυρίῳ. Wordsworth follows Origen in joining these words with what immediately precedes, as implying that the work of an amanuensis, not less than that of an apostle, is done "in the Lord." Most commentators connect it with ἀσπάζομαι, which is preferable.—R.]

Ver. 23. **Gaius.** Caius. See the Lexicons on the frequent occurrence of the name. The identity with the Caius in 1 Cor. i. 14 is very probable; perhaps he is also the same person as the Caius in Acts xx. 4. Paul was now lodging with him, as he had already done with others.—Probably also a household congregation gathered in his house. [Or he may have been universal in his hospitality to Christians (Alford).—R.]

Erastus. The city treasurer. The same name in Acts xix. 22 and 2 Tim. iv. 20 does not seem to denote the same person, unless, as Meyer remarks, Erastus had given up his position.—**Quartus** [Κούαρτος. This shows how the Greeks transferred the sound of the Latin *Qu* into their language.—R.] A brother in a general Christian sense.

B. Vers. 25–27.—Ver. 25. **Now to him who is able to stablish you** [Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι. To this dative, that of ver. 27 corresponds, all that intervenes being dependent in some way upon δυναμένῳ. The real grammatical difficulty is therefore in ver. 27.—R.] Στηρίξαι. See chap. i. 11; 1 Thess. iii. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 17. He is very solicitous that the Church in Rome be steadfast and faithful. He clothes his solicitude in the form of a liturgical antiphony, in which he again takes up the first Amen, in order to say Amen to the three solemn representations of the gospel of God, in the name of the Roman Church, and of all God's churches in general. Comp. the liturgical meaning of the Amen in 1 Cor. xiv. 16.

According to my gospel [κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου]. According to this view of the doxology, we do not explain κατά in reference to my gospel, but according to my gospel, as an antiphony to my gospel—and, mentally, for the first, second, and third time. If we mistake this liturgical form, this doxology becomes a network of exegetical difficulties. The first κατά is explained by Meyer: may He establish you in relation to my gospel, that you may remain perseveringly true to my gospel. For other explanations, see the same author, p. 551 f. [Philippi, Alford, and others, agree, in the main, with Meyer: *in reference to*—*i. e., in* my gospel; He can establish you, or, "in subordination to, and according to the requirements of" (Alford), my gospel. Dr. Hodge prefers *through*, which is scarcely defensible lexically. Dr. Lange's view of the preposition depends on his view of the doxology as a whole.—R.]

And the preaching of Jesus Christ [καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ]. As it is not only spread abroad in his gospel, but also outside of it, in all the world. Explanations: 1. The preaching concerning Christ (Luther, Calvin, Tholuck, and Philippi); 2. The preaching which Christ causes to be promulgated through him (Meyer, and others), 3. The preaching of Christ during His stay on earth (Grotius).*

According to the revelation [κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν. The κατά is taken by Meyer, and others, as coördinate to the former one, and dependent on στηρίξαι; by Tholuck, and others, as dependent on the whole opening clause, in the sense of *in consequence of;* by Alford, and others, as subordinate to κήρυγμα.—R.] This is the specific designation of the universality of the gospel according to Paul's view; Eph. iii. 3, 9; Col. i. 26, &c.—**The mystery** relates particularly to the freedom or national enlargement of the gospel. [Philippi, and others, unnecessarily limit *mystery* here to this enlargement of the gospel. It seems best to take it in its full meaning. See chap. xi. 25.—R.]

Ver. 26. [**But now is made manifest,** φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν. This is obviously in antithesis to the latter part of the preceding verse. The question respecting the relation of the clauses is, however, a difficult one. Beza, Flatt, Meyer, De Wette, and others, join these words closely with ver. 25, making the rest of this verse subordinate to γνωρισθέντος. They render somewhat thus: "But which is made manifest in the present age, and by means of the prophetic Scriptures, according to the command of the everlasting God, is made known unto all nations, in order to lead them to the obedience of the faith." Hodge, Alford, and others, join together the first part of the verse as far as "the everlasting God;" while Dr. Lange takes the third κατά as coördinate to the first and second. Besides, there is room for a great variety of opinion in regard to the relation of the different phrases.—R.]

Through the Scriptures of the prophets [διά τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν. The presence of τε seems to favor the connection with what follows, but Dr. Lange renders "*as* through," &c.,

* [The ground of this supposed identity is that the Hebrew word answering to the Latin *Tertius* (שְׁלִישִׁי) sounds like Silas. But the latter is a contraction from *Silvanus.*—R.]

* [Of these, (3.) seems most untenable. (1.) makes this phrase an extension of the preceding one; (2.) an explanation of it. They are not, however, contradictory of each other. Dr. Lange seems really to combine them.—R.]

thus adopting the other view.—R.] By this addition, Paul proves that this present revelation, whose special organ is Paul himself, is not neologically new, but according to the analogy of faith. *Through the Scriptures of the prophets* means, that their sense has now become fully clear.*

According to the commandment of the everlasting God [κατ᾽ ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου Θεοῦ. See *Textual Note* [3], on Dr. Lange's rendering.—R.] Here Meyer's view of the construction of κατά does not hold good any longer, and therefore he makes the third principal proposition as a supplement to the second: *and by means of the prophetic writings according to the commandment of the everlasting God*, &c. This commandment is the last form, the last word, because it brings very near to the Church at Rome the obligatory duty of interesting itself in the work of the world's conversion. The commandment of the *eternal* God should, as an injunction continually resounding, find an eternal reëcho in the Amen of the Church.†

Ver. 27. **To the only wise God**, &c. [μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ, κ.τ.λ.] Meyer: "To the only wise God through Jesus Christ."‡ Curious words! Better: To the only wise God be the glory through Christ (Luther, Beza [E. V.]). Yet the ᾧ opposes this view, if we refer it to Christ. The ᾧ, indeed, has been cancelled by Beza and Grotius, according to cursives 33, 72, and Rufinus; but it stands firm, and is also no obstruction to the proper construction of this doxology. For by all means there belongs to Christ, or the Lamb, the honor of unsealing the book of God's mysteries, and in eternity the Church can utter thanksgiving and praise to Him for it in the Amen of the Church. Comp. Rev. v. 12. [It must be added, however, that while the glory may be very properly ascribed to Christ, it is grammatically harsh to refer the relative ᾧ to Christ, since Θεῷ is the leading word in this verse, and by implication throughout.—R].

Because the force of the last *Amen* was mistaken, many supposed that the Apostle was gradually led, by the parentheses, from the doxology to God, to the doxology to Christ (Tholuck, Philippi). Such a great obscurity would be a bad crown to his grand and clear work. Besides, the previous repetition μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ is against it. Other suppositions—that the ᾧ is a pleonasm, standing for αὐτῷ*—as well as the proposed supplements, prove only that there must be a mistake in the whole conception of the doxology. We may regard it as removed by the liturgical construction of the conclusion corresponding to the fundamental liturgical thought of the Epistle. The Amen of eternity shall again ascend to God through Christ, just as the eternal gospel has come from God to man through Him. But we do not read τὸ ἀμήν, because the conclusion is not didactic, but a prayer.

[Dr. Lange thus avoids an anacoluthon, by making a double doxology, as it were—to God an eternally accordant Amen, to Christ the glory. It must be confessed that this view is novel, with scarcely an analogy in the New Testament or elsewhere; yet it is beautiful, poetic, and appropriate. For the Apostle, in closing such an Epistle as this, must have been filled with thoughts not less grand than these. Still, should we accept the view of Meyer, the thought remains grand, Pauline, and appropriate. (See Winer, p. 528, on the anacoluthon.) For he who had dived so deeply into the riches of the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ, might well close by declaring that God was revealed as *absolute wisdom* in Jesus Christ, and ascribe to Him, as such, the glory forever. And when, through the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to this gospel, the mystery of God's love in Jesus Christ shall be made known to all nations, and they, through the knowledge of the revealed Scriptures, become obedient in faith, then to Him, whose wisdom shall be thus revealed, be all the glory. The true antiphonical AMEN is pronounced by those who labor for and await that glory, who to-day, with uplifted heads, expect the final triumph, not less than he who closes his great Epistle in such confidence.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. See the *Exeg. Notes*.
2. The doxology is presented to God, as the only wise, in the same sense as His wisdom, in the economy of salvation, is glorified at the conclusion of chap. xi.
3. On the liturgical meaning of the AMEN, comp. Deut. xxvii. 15 ff.; Ps. cvi. 48; 1 Chron. xvi. 36 1 Cor. xiv. 16; but *especially* Eph. iii. 21.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

CHAP. XVI. 1-16.

The abundance of apostolic salutations (vers. 1-16).—The Apostle's good memory of his friends (vers. 1-16).—Phebe, a pattern for every Christian deaconess. 1. Every one, like her, should minister to the poor and sick in the Church of the Lord; 2. Every one, like her, should not *teach* God's word, but *bring it over*, as Phebe brought the Epistle to the Romans to Rome (vers. 1, 2).—The evangelical office of the deaconess arose from living faith: 1. In the apostolic Church; 2. In the Middle Ages; 3. At the present time.—How should our churches act toward the deaconesses?—He who exercises love may also lay claim to love (ver. 2).—Aquila and

* [The sense is accordingly much the same, whether this phrase limit "made manifest" or "made known." In the former case, the thought is supplementary: "It is made manifest in these gospel times, and that, too, by means of the prophetic writings;" in the latter, more emphasis would rest upon it. It is objected to the latter, that the writings of the prophets were not actually the means employed in the universal diffusion of the gospel; to the former, that there is an incongruity in thus speaking of a mystery "kept in silence," and yet made manifest now by writings of the earlier date Either of these may be readily met. On grammatical grounds the preference should be given to the connection with what follows, unless Dr. Lange's syntax be adopted, which, by taking the following κατά as coördinate to the previous ones, precludes this view.—R.]

† [If Dr. Lange's view be not accepted, then Meyer's is to be preferred: This general making known took place: (1.) By means of the prophetic Scriptures; (2.) According to the command of God; (3.) For the establishment of the obedience of faith; (4.) Among all nations. So most commentators.—The word αἰωνίου, *everlasting*, has been deemed superfluous; yet it seems specially appropriate.—"The first εἰς indicates the *aim*—in order to their becoming obedient to the faith: the second, the *local extent* of the manifestation" (Alford).—R.]

‡ ["*To God, who through Christ appears as the only wise*; so wise, that, in comparison with Him, the predicate *wise* can be attributed to no other being, the *absolutely* wise;" Meyer. This view now meets with much favor.—R.]

* [Hodge: "To the only wise God, through Jesus Christ, to Him, I say, be glory forever." So Stuart, taking ᾧ in the demonstrative sense.—R.]

Priscilla, a Christian couple of the apostolic age; comp. Acts xviii. 2, 26 (vers 3, 4).—Aquila and Priscilla contrasted with Ananias and Sapphira; comp. Acts v. 1 ff.—The Christian Church originally a household church (ver. 5).—The family, the birthplace of Christian service in the Gentile world; comp. Acts x. 17; xvi. 34, 40; xviii. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 19 (ver. 5).—The Marys of the New Testament. 1. Mary, the mother of our Lord; 2. Mary, the sister of the mother of Jesus; 3. Mary of Bethany; 4. Mary Magdalene; 5. Mary, the mother of John Mark; 6. The Roman Mary (ver. 6).—See the Concordance.

The Marys of the New Testament grouped in pairs. 1. Two of them belong to the immediate family of Jesus; 2. Two are friends of our Lord; 3. Two are protectresses of His apostles (ver. 6).—The various yet well-considered designations of the individuals saluted by the Apostle: Helpers in Christ (ver. 3); well-beloved, my beloved, beloved (vers. 5, 9, 12); beloved in the Lord (ver. 8); approved in Christ (ver. 10); chosen in the Lord (ver. 13); sister (ver. 1).—The salutation with a holy kiss (ver. 16).—The holy kiss of fraternal fellowship, and the Judas-kiss of the betrayer (ver. 16).

Luther, on ver. 17: This is said against all doctrines of men.

Starke: Christianity does not abrogate worldly transactions and external business, but rather directs them aright, and brings a blessing upon them (ver. 2).—Hedinger: How beautiful! Pious women in the service of the Church, taking care of widows, children, the poor, and the sick! Oh, how sadly has this zeal died out in the Church; every one is for himself in his own house! Yet who does not see the footprints of a God still living? (ver. 2.)

Spener: We see, at least, that women are prohibited from no spiritual employment, with the exception of the public office of the ministry (ver. 2).—With a *holy* kiss, without any wantonness, actual or imagined (ver. 16).

Heubner: Commendations of the Christian are very different from merely worldly ones, for they have a holy cause and a holy purpose (vers. 1, 2).—Natural weakness, strengthened by grace, accomplishes much (ver. 6 ff.).—The true Christian must read all these names with hearty interest, even though we know but little or nothing of their works. Their names stand in the Book of Life.—Celebrity, so called, is something very ambiguous; the lowest faithful servant of Christ is more than the most admired worldly hero.—Pious souls can even wish to remain concealed, λαθεῖν βιώσας (vers. 5, 6 ff.).—The kiss can be most unholy and most holy (ver. 16).

[Burkitt, on vers. 5–7: O happy houses, and thrice happy householders, whose families are little churches for piety and devotion!—Observe: 1. That seniority in grace is a very great honor: and to be in Christ before others, is a transcendent prerogative. 2. That God will have the good works of all His saints, and the services especially which are done to His ministers and ambassadors by any of His people, to be applauded, valued, and recorded.—Henry: In Christian congregations there should be lesser societies, linked together in love and converse, and taking opportunities of being often together.—Doddridge: Many women have been eminently useful. The most valuable ministers have often been assisted by them in the success of their work, while their pious care, under the restraint of the strictest modesty and decorum, has happily and effectually influenced children, servants, and young friends; yea, has been the means of sowing the seeds of religion in tender minds, before they have been capable of coming under ministerial care.—Scott: We should hope the best of others, and commend what is good in their conduct.—Hodge: The social relations in which Christians stand to each other as relatives, countrymen, friends, should not be allowed to give character to their feelings and conduct to the exclusion of the more important relation which they bear to Christ. It is as friends, helpers, fellow-laborers in the Lord, that they are to be recognized.—Barnes: Religion binds the hearts of all who embrace it tenderly together. It makes them feel that they are one great family, united by tender ties, and joined by peculiar attachments.—J. F. H.]

Vers. 17–27.

Warning against disturbers of the Church. The Apostle pronounces against them: 1. With all frankness, designating them, *a.* as those who cause divisions and offences; *b.* whom the others should avoid, because they are not in Christ, but serve themselves, and deceive simple hearts by honeyed words and false speeches. 2. With all confidence in the members of the Church at Rome; because, *a.* their obedience is come abroad unto all men; *b.* he himself is glad on their behalf; *c.* but desires that they be very careful, wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil. 3. With the strongest hope in the God of peace, who he expects will shortly bruise Satan under the feet of believers (vers. 17–20).—On divisions and offences in the Church (ver. 17).—We can cause offence, not only by a bad life, but also by bad teaching (ver. 17).—Good words and fair speeches very easily deceive simple hearts (ver. 18).—Not every thing which tastes sweet is healthy, nor is every thing which has a pleasing sound true (ver. 18).

Wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil! Comp. Matt. x. 16; 1 Cor. xiv. 20 (ver. 19).—The God of peace conquers, Satan is trodden upon (ver. 20).—To God alone be glory through Jesus Christ forever! Amen (vers. 25–27).

Starke, Hedinger: Christians are not dumb blocks (Ps. cxix. 100, 104); but industrious, wise, zealous in that which is good, full of excellent counsel and wise execution. But it is owing to their godly simplicity and love that they do not understand wickedness, intrigues, and all kinds of low tricks (especially when men make themselves pleasant, according to the flesh, by shifting about, talking politics, and flattering with the cross of Christ), and are often deceived (ver. 19).

Spener: A lie cannot stand long, but must finally be exposed (ver. 20).

Bengel: In this whole Epistle the Apostle mentions *the enemy* but once; in all his Epistles he mentions *Satan* nine times, and the *devil* six times (ver. 20).

Lisco: Warning against deceivers. 1. Import; 2. Description of false teachers; 3. Ground of warning; 4. Comfort (vers. 17–24).—The ascription of praise to God, and the wish for His blessing. 1. The subject of the ascription of praise; 2. Its ground (vers. 25–27).

Heubner: The holiest union can be dissolved

by evil desire and unbelief; the purpose of the evil spirit is always separation and destruction (*Divide et impera!*). This takes place especially by means of false teachers (vers. 17, 18).—The world is wise in doing evil, and unskilful in doing good (ver. 19).—By God and His Spirit we can conquer Satan and his works. Christ has begun to destroy the works of Satan, though the task is not yet finished (ver. 20).

[FARINDON, on ver. 20: If the devil inspire evil thoughts, God is both able and willing to inspire good; and in all our trials, in all time of our tribulation, and in all time of our wealth, in the hour of death and in the day of judgment, His "grace is sufficient for" us.

[JEREMY TAYLOR: All people who desire the benefit of the gospel are bound to have a fellowship and society with these saints, and communicate with them in their holy things, in their faith, and in their hope, and in their sacraments, and in their prayers, and in their public assemblies, and in their government; and must do to them all the acts of charity and mutual help which they can and are required to; and without this communion of saints, and a conjunction with them who believe in God through Jesus Christ, there is no salvation to be expected: which communion must be kept in inward things always, and by all persons, and testified by outward acts always, when it is possible, and may be done upon just and holy conditions.

[BURKITT: God is only wise, because all wisdom is derived from Him; all the wisdom of angels and men is but a ray from His light, a drop from His ocean. Let the wisdom of God, in all His dealings with us and ours, be admired and adored by us; for all His works of providence are as orderly and perfect as His works of creation, though we perceive it not.

[HENRY: Mark those that cause divisions; mark the method they take, the end they drive at; there is no need of a piercing, watchful eye, to discern the danger we are in from such people; for commonly the pretences are plausible, when the projects are very pernicious. Do not look only at the divisions and offences, but run up those streams to the fountain, and mark those that cause them; and especially that in them which causes these divisions and offences; those lusts on each side, whence come these wars and fightings. A danger discovered is half prevented.

[SCOTT: In order to maintain communion with the Lord and with His saints uninterrupted, avoid, with decided disapprobation, those persons who aim to prejudice believers against each other, to draw them off from faithful pastors, or to seduce them into strange doctrines, contrary to the simple truths of God's word.

[CLARKE: The Church of God has ever been troubled with pretended pastors, men who feed themselves, and not the flock; men who are too proud to beg, and too lazy to work; who have neither grace nor gifts to plant the standard of the cross on the devil's territories, and, by the power of Christ, make inroads upon his kingdom, and spoil him of his subjects. By sowing the seeds of dissensions, by means of doubtful disputations, and the propagation of scandals; by glaring and insinuating speeches—for they affect elegance and good breeding—they rend Christian congregations, form a party for themselves, and thus live on the spoils of the Church of God.

[HODGE: However much the Church may be distracted and troubled, error and its advocates cannot finally prevail. Satan is a conquered enemy with a lengthened chain.

[BARNES: Let men make peace their prime object, resolve to love all who are Christians, and it will be an infallible gauge by which to measure the arguments of those who seek to promote alienations and contentions.

[M'CLINTOCK: There is nothing in religion incompatible with the natural affections. Nay, you will find that he who loves God most, has the strongest and most trustworthy love for kindred and friends. The human affections are purged of all dross by the fire of love to God. A heart full of charity prompts to all good and kind actions, just when they are called for. It will give tears, when tears and sympathy can bless or save; it will give sacrifice, when sacrifice can help or save some suffering soul. Earnest love to God *must* display itself in tender attributes, in good, kind, and gentle ministrations—in *all* forms of benevolence and personal sacrifice. And these things become the more easy, the more we know of the love of God.

[HOMILETICAL LITERATURE *on ver.* 17: JOHN READING, *Serm.* (London, 1642); G. CROFT, *The Evils of Separation, Bampton Lect.*, 163; JOHNSON GRANT, *The Primitive Church, Disc.* (1843), 204.—On ver. 19: JOHN JORTIN, *Religious Wisdom, Serm.*, vol. i. 300; BISHOP HURD, *Sermons, Works*, vol. vi. 215; JOHN MORLEY, *Disc.*, 99; JOSEPH HORDERN, *The Christian's Wisdom and Simplicity, Serm.*, 199; A. N. DARNELL, *Serm.*, 247; C. SIMEON, *Practical Wisdom Recommended, Works*, vol. xv. 592.—On ver. 27: CHARNOCK, *The Wisdom of God, Works*, vol. ii. 146; DANIEL WHITBY, *The Wisdom of God, Sermon on the Attributes of God*, vol. i. 226; G. BURDER, *The Wisdom of God, Village Sermons*, vi.—J. F. H.]